THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1926. Vol. XV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. Goudge's Pamphlet.

Under the title *Conflicting Tendencies in the Church of England*,* the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford has republished, with some additions, an article originally contributed by him to the *Contemporary Review*. His object is to explain Anglo-Catholicism, including the extreme form, 'to those men of goodwill who misunderstand it.' In so far as the differences between Anglo-Catholics and Modernists are due to misunderstanding, Dr. Goudge's essay both by its tone and content will tend to remove it. To remove misunderstanding is not necessarily to remove differences, and we think it probable that fuller mutual understanding may make the differences the more apparent, but, we hope at the same time, or a little later, lead us to see that they are less vitally connected with religion than we are wont to suppose. For ourselves we believe that the only solution lies in the recognition of the urgent necessity of reducing the number of *authoritative* intellectual and historical propositions about matters in which at best probability is alone attainable, but to which adherence is at present demanded from those who wish to serve Christ in the Church and Ministry. This would not necessarily involve 'a reduced Christianity.'

Like most of us, Dr. Goudge is a little anxious about the limits of comprehensiveness, but he is in no doubt as to the necessity for comprehensiveness or that it must involve the toleration of much with which we disagree and do not like.

* Published by A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd. (Price 1/-.)

'What is the use,' he asks, 'of priding ourselves upon our comprehensiveness and then refusing to comprehend?' He is equally clearly opposed to any adoption of the Roman method of dealing with doctrinal difficulties:

> 'If the danger were to arise of a suppression of free enquiry, like that which we have witnessed in the Church of Rome, the scholars and thinkers of every school of thought would rise as one man to avert it. . . . Most Anglo-Catholics recognize that the problem of the relation of faith to modern knowledge is difficult; that we cannot cut knots which require to be carefully unravelled; . . . Anglo-Catholicism as to-day we find it is still in great need of the Evangelical protest against legalism, and of the Modernist protest against obscurantism,'

and similar criticism applies to both correctives.

There is much in this essay which will make Modernists wonder if they are not Anglo-Catholics after all! Dr. Goudge sketches an ideal and attractive Catholicism within which, even where they disagree with it, Modernists could live and work for the Kingdom of God. There is also of course much that they cannot accept; and the type of Church with which there is an implied and occasionally an explicit identification of Christianity is such that, while we may live and work within it, will, we feel, never again be generally accepted in the educated modern world, not least because 'from the beginning it was not so'; and in so far as it is accepted it must, we think, necessarily render the truly Catholic ideal of the Church incapable of any adequate realization. In our opinion, this is evident from the essay itself, with which we hope to deal more fully in the near future. Meanwhile we call attention to it in order that our readers may study the best that can be said for a position which, while containing much that is attractive, as a whole they cannot share.

The Birmingham Controversy.

When we pass from Dr. Goudge's sympathetic exposition of the aims of Anglo-Catholicism to the actuality with which we have to deal, it is as difficult as it is probably useless to write with restraint. From the time of the announcement of the appointment of Dr. Barnes to the see of Birmingham he has been made the subject of a bitter and persistent attack, often not free from personal insult, by the *Church Times*, and solely on the ground that he was known to maintain opinions inconsistent with the claims and the teaching of the type of Catholicism represented by that paper, though not inconsistent with the

standards of the Church of England. The Bishop discovered that there were in his diocese several churches wherein, contrary to the explicit regulations of the Prayer-Book, it was the custom to reserve the Sacrament in the open church and to allow, if not to encourage, members of the congregation to pray before it, and also to hold a service called Devotions in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, similar to the Roman rites of Exposition and Benediction. The Bishop required that these practices should cease, and has consistently condemned them as resting on false doctrine and involving superstitious and magical views of the Sacrament. He has also called attention to the fact, of which New Testament students have been for long aware, that but a frail foundation exists in the recorded acts and words of Jesus for the elaborate system of eucharistic speculation, taught as authoritative doctrine, which would appear to be the most fundamental thing in the Anglo-Catholic presentation of Christianity. Whatever may be thought of the Bishop's condemnation of the doctrine—and we believe the facts (so far as they can be known), reason, and experience to be on his side—there can be no doubt, and it is not disputed, that he is acting within the limits of his authority as an English Diocesan, in ordering that they shall cease. Although the introduction of such practices is fairly recent, there is already episcopal precedent, including that of Dr. Gore, for so doing, not to stress the notorious fact that Dr. Barnes is acting in accordance with the convictions of many other Bishops. Yet this action, admittedly lawful, has been for months past trumpeted as an attack on the fundamentals of the faith, and as a bitter persecution; it is held to justify the withholding of financial and other co-operation from diocesan organizations with which his lordship is associated; and we witness the spectacle of Anglo-Catholic clergy from other dioceses offering their help, and the English Church Union raising funds, to resist the Bishop in the exercise of his lawful authority.

There is a still less pleasant side to the story. The *Church Times* thinks it honest to hold the Bishop responsible for all disorganization of the Church's work, whether in the diocese or in the parishes, resulting from this lamentable controversy; the Bishop's only practical power of maintaining discipline is to withhold licences to assistant clergy in parishes where he is de-

fied, and if he does this the same paper does not shrink from the vulgarity of accusing him of indifference to the strain and possible injury to the health of incumbents thus deprived of licensed clerical assistance, and continues to publish letters containing such foolish and flagrantly untrue statements as that the Bishop denies 'that God can give us Divine strength through material channels.' We do not call this kind of thing un-Christian; that would be to judge it by a standard to which it bears no relation. It is simply disgusting.

An Amazing Manifesto.

Some months ago the English Church Union, taking upon itself the duty, hitherto supposed to pertain to the Bishops, of maintaining sound and banishing false doctrine from the Church of England, and of judging between them, issued a pompous and personally offensive document. It claimed to be the work of scholars, whose names were withheld, and it condemned the views of Dr. Barnes about the sacraments and their history as unscholarly and erroneous. The Union has now followed up and extended the precedent thus set for itself in the following extraordinary manifesto which appeared in *The Times* of Tuesday, December 29th:

> At a meeting of the Council of the English Church Union held on Wednesday, November 18, 1925, it was resolved that the support of the union should be given to those clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham who are contending:
>
> 1. That reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is required in order to communicate the sick and dying at any time.
>
> 2. That reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is required to give Communion to those who are prevented from being able to receive at the service itself.
>
> 3. That the people should not be prohibited from the opportunity of devotion before the Blessed Sacrament so reserved.
>
> This policy has been decided on in view of the following considerations:
>
> 1. That the Bishop of Birmingham's directions are avowedly part of a campaign against the doctrine of a real objective presence in the Holy Eucharist, a doctrine the legality of which in the Church of England has not been challenged for more than a generation.
>
> 2. That the present conditions of reservation in the Diocese of Birmingham were approved by the late Diocesan.
>
> 3. That pending the decision of the Episcopate as a whole in regard to the mode of reservation, which will be expressed in the revised Prayer-book, the faithful of one diocese ought not to be deprived, by the arbitrary will of a single Bishop, of devotional privileges which are enjoyed without molestation by the faithful of most English dioceses.

One hardly knows whether to be more astonished at the ambiguity of the claims of the three contentions or at the hardihood of the considerations on which it is determined to support them. The inclusion of the first and second demands is seriously misleading; the Bishop is, we believe, though contrary to his own belief as to what is desirable, prepared not to forbid reservation for those purposes provided such reservation be made 'in some private place to which public access is impossible.' The third contention is so worded as to make it impossible to decide whether the right to the service of Devotions is or is not included in it. It is probably designedly so phrased in order to include both interpretations. The first of the considerations is so obscurely worded as to be, as it stands, almost false. The Bishop has explicitly affirmed his belief in a real presence in the Holy Communion; the question at issue is the relation of this presence to the consecrated bread and wine apart from the whole service of which the acts of consecration and participation are but parts. Secondly, it is an astounding claim that because one Bishop allows reservation under certain conditions, and against the law as it now stands, his successors shall be bound to allow it under the same conditions, and that his clergy are justified in refusing obedience if he does not. Thirdly, as at present the giving or withholding of permission to reserve depends in fact on the judgment of the individual Bishop, it is no more an exhibition of 'arbitrary will' to forbid it than it is to allow it. Moreover, if what has been approved by the House of Clergy is any guide, there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the Revised Prayer-Book will allow 'the opportunity of devotion before the Blessed Sacrament so reserved' whatever interpretation be placed upon that ambiguous phrase.

The comment supplied by the following extract from a letter to *The Times* of January 5th by the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich correctly explains the position:

> 'At a time when no voice has been more urgent than the voice of the party which the Union represents in asking that matters should now be left to the House of Bishops, the English Church Union throws down a challenge to the Church and nation and appears to claim a liberty which at the present time Churchmen certainly do not possess, and in making that claim it clearly expects that that liberty will soon be granted.
>
> The right to have the Sacrament reserved and to have opportunities furnished for devotions before the reserved Sacrament is unquestion-

ably not recognized by the present Prayer-book, which, indeed, prohibits them in terms too plain to leave room for doubt. The claim goes far beyond any proposals which are before the House of Bishops, whether in the original Measure as generally approved by the Church Assembly, or in any amendments adopted by the House of Clergy or the House of Laity. It is really to challenge the doctrinal position of the Church of England, which is not now in question, nor are there any proposals before us directly to alter it.

Moreover, the pronouncement of the Council of the English Church Union calls in question the claim of the Bishop of a diocese upon the obedience of his clergy, and gives its support to those who refuse it. But that is precisely the method on which the government of the Church is built, to which every clergyman officiating in the Diocese of Birmingham has declared his adhesion on oath. Every incumbent and every licensed curate has taken his oath, renewed at every fresh appointment, to obey the particular Bishop he first served under and his successors, whoever they might be. It has been often difficult to reconcile a virtual refusal to keep to the terms of that oath in the case of men who are clearly men of good character and devoted and intending to live an upright life. It is another thing to find the Council of the English Church Union in effect supporting the repudiation of that oath.'

The manifesto is not only a demand for what is at present illegal in the Church of England, but an open declaration of the intention to secure it by the organized resistance of lawful authority. 'Nay, but thou shalt give it me now: and if not I will take it by force.' So they did in Shiloh. If this policy triumphs, the control which through long-continued inaction has so largely passed from the Bishops will vanish altogether. We hope that the Council of the Churchmen's Union will take steps, not only to give the Bishop of Birmingham the support which is his due, but also to strengthen the hands of the Bishops in resisting the autocracy of the E.C.U. For it is certain that if its policy wins in Birmingham the Church of England will have gone a long way towards becoming intolerable for all educated men except the minority who can accept the theology of the Counter-Reformation in its modern developments, the journalistic methods of the *Church Times*, and the papacy of the English Church Union.

The Second Coming and The League.

The ideal of the League of Nations is the subject of criticism both from those who believe in it and from those who think it impracticable, but we should have thought it incredible that anyone would deny that it is a Christian ideal. The correspondence columns of *The Guardian* however, have recently borne witness to opposition to the League on the ground that the Gospels teach that there must inevitably be wars before the

Second Coming of Christ, and that we ought not to attempt to prevent them lest haply we be found to fight against God. Our contemporary was moved to deal with this novel polyphonic objection in a leading article, and did so in a way which has convinced us that we shall soon have to share our distinction of using traditional language in a sense fundamentally different from that which it has hitherto borne. Realizing that the text of the Gospels seems to lend support to the objection, the line adopted in meeting it was to urge that although eschatology rather than belief in gradual human betterment has been the inspiring motive of Christians, nevertheless, broadly speaking, Christianity has contributed more than anything else to the improvement of the human lot. Of the early Christians the writer said: 'The New Age for whose perfect realization they looked had already in a most true sense begun. It began with the coming of Jesus. . . . In His Church the powers of the age to come were already at work. They felt it in themselves. They could not rest till they had done all in their power to make the world as ready for His coming as might be.'

And to-day:

'Progress is not the dominant thought of the Christian. The supreme place in his imagination is occupied by a new heaven and a new earth, of God's framing.'

Except as concluding rhetoric or the language of devotion, we are not sure that we understand exactly what is meant by the last sentence. The fact is that for the early Christians the Second Coming of Christ was to inaugurate rather than to consummate the New Age for which they hoped. Moreover, they were as sure of the imminence as of the fact of the Second Coming, nor would they have felt that Jesus' admission that He did not know the *day* or the *hour* at all inconsistent with their hope. When that hope was falsified it was thrown into the indefinite future, and this was one of the ways in which a crisis in the Church was tided over.

To-day, with our very different estimate of the eschatalogical literature, whether canonical or not, as affording useful information about the future, we can no longer hold the early Christian hope of the Second Coming in any sense comparable to that in which the early Christians held it. 'The Second Coming of our Lord does not loom large in what may be called the working faith of the average Christian to-day,' says *The*

Guardian. The truth is that if we think of the end at all, we contemplate something entirely different from the early Christian hope of the Second Coming. With our contemporary, we believe in the paramount Christian duty of working for the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth which will indeed open to man a new heaven as well. But that is not the Second Coming. We are often accused of being destructive; we fear we must be so as long as those who really agree with us continue to do verbal homage to ideas the prevalence of which makes any restatement of Christian theology impossible. 'We need,' says *The Guardian*, 'to recover the pristine faith in the Second Coming of our Lord, just because it gives (as nothing else can) the answer to the despairing cry that "the struggle naught availeth."' Our comment on the first part of that statement is that as modern men we can do nothing of the kind: our comment on the second part is that it is simply not true. 'Hitherto hath the Lord helped us,' and the measure of past achievement is the sure ground of continued hope for the future and an ever-present answer to despair—if we continue faithful.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PREACHING

By the Rev. Professor McComb, D.D., Episcopal Theological School, Harvard University.

'MOST of the time we live outside ourselves, we perceive only a colourless phantom of our real ego . . . . we perceive this real ego whenever by a resolute effort of reflection we detach our eyes from the shadow which follows us in order to enter into ourselves.' So writes Bergson. And Coleridge had said the same thing before Bergson when he laments that the majority of mankind are nowhere greater strangers than at home, in the inner world of their nature. It is to this lack of self-knowledge that many failures in the pulpit are to be traced. A sermon may embody all the laws of homiletics. It may contain fine ideas, logically set forth, well illustrated and properly applied, and yet it may wholly fail to catch the attention of the congregation or to win their good-will. Why? Frequently because behind it there is not a 'live' man full of sacred enthusiasm, fired with a passion to persuade or uplift or console.

Preaching is the oral communication of divine truth. The Christian message is, in the oft-quoted phrase of Phillips Brooks, 'truth through personality,' a principle of which perhaps he was himself the most signal illustration. In other words, the reality of the sermon depends on the reality of the man who preaches it. It was said of Francis of Assisi that as people listened to him their hearts glowed with unwonted desire of the higher life, yet when they tried to recall his words, they seemed flat and unsatisfying. The fire, the spirit, the *élan vital* had fled; St. Francis, that is to say, was himself the sermon; the words were the mere symbols whereby personality expressed itself. 'The personality of the preacher back of the words makes the difference between a good sermon and a poor one, a difference not so easy to distinguish in a written discourse. One may speak of this as temperament, but temperament plus; it is the man as a whole, the balance of his powers and his methods. People are not tired of preaching, but only of certain styles of sermons and preachers. It is the personality which is not attractive. Rather than any particular truth or sermon, the chief thing that a man contributed is his tone—the influence of his personality; if that is lacking he is as booming brass or a clanging cymbal. Whether the minister feels the congregation or not, the congregation feels the minister.'[1] If, therefore, we would be effective preachers we must study our own natures, remove the hindrances to effective self-expression, and concentrate all our powers on the highest notch of their possibilities. How can we hope to read the hearts of other men, if we have never read our own?

Philo maintains that only a good man can be an interpreter of God, 'for properly speaking no wicked man can be inspired, inspiration being appropriate only for a *wise* man.'[2] Now the spiritual essence of a real sermon lies in the element of revelation, that is, in other words, the perception of spiritual truth. But even when our conscience assures us of our integrity, we need to know the prevailing characteristics of our mental life.

There are certain questions which the preacher should put to himself and answer. Is my mind of a severely logical and philosophical type, or is it emotional and sentimental? Have I imaginative powers? Is my public speaking effective? And

[1] C. B. Cutien: *Psychological Phenomena of Christianity*, p. 478.

[2] Quis rer. div. sit. LXII. *Wise* meant to the Hebrew essentially *moral*.

if not, why not? What kind of persons does my personality attract? What kind does it repel? Have I a rich or a meagre subconscious activity? Have I a sense of humour? Have I a strong will? Have I the oratorical impulse? Or is my nature cold and reserved? The introspection needed in answering these questions will result in an increasing knowledge of the human soul and a heightened sympathy with the weaknesses and deficiencies of our fellows. Let us examine, therefore, the psychological elements on which our preaching will depend for power and success.

1. *The influence of the subconscious mind in preaching.*

The subconscious is a subject which is rarely considered by students of preaching, and yet here as in other spheres of mental activity it is of vital significance. Subconscious influence affects our every thought and motive. We have all puzzled over questions which seemed insoluble, and then suddenly when our minds were occupied with some trivial thought or fancy, a flash of light illumined our mental horizon and our difficulties vanished without any effort on our part. What a reinforcement to our powers would come to us if we could enlist the subconscious as an aid in our work of preaching! Before considering how this may be done, it is well to remember that too often the preacher's subconsciousness stands in his way, sets up all sorts of barriers, and denies any real transmissive function to his personality. It is a curious fact that some men when they enter the pulpit, cease to be their free, natural selves; they become stilted, unnatural and ineffective. A parishioner once told a distinguished clergyman that if he would only speak in the pulpit as he spoke at the dinner table, freely, naturally, spontaneously, his efficiency would be increased by one hundred per cent. He took the good advice and became one of the most successful preachers of his time. Even great pulpit orators have occasionally been self-inhibited. Matthew Arnold tells us in one of his letters how he was disappointed in hearing Henry Ward Beecher preach. He felt that the orator was held back from letting himself go in his usual manner by the fact that he had been informed of Arnold's presence in the congregation. How often lesser men are paralysed by fear, the dread of making mistakes, undue anxiety about their words and manner. Some are in bondage through these

fears all their lifetime. It is by no means easy to get rid of mental and moral inhibitions; yet they must be swept away if the word is to have free course and accomplish its mission. How is the self-inhibited preacher to be set free? (1) By the conviction that he speaks not of himself but as one sent by Another and a Higher. To cultivate this prophetic consciousness is to win the prophet's strength. 'Take your position as the ambassador of Jesus Christ,' says Adolphe Monod, 'sent by God to treat with sinful men; believe that he who sends you will not leave you to speak in vain; labour for the salvation of those whom you address as if it were your own . . . . you will then tremble more before God and less before man. You will then speak with liberty. If our faith were perfect, we should scarcely be in more danger of falling into false or declamatory tones, than of men crying out to a drowning man to seize the rope which is thrown out to save him.'[3] These words are true, but with many they may not prove themselves true at once. Again and again the preacher's faith will weaken, and he will leave the pulpit self-reproachful and unhappy. There is but one remedy. More courage, more resolution, more of the heroic determination that says, 'I will no longer be in bondage to these miserable fears. I must shake off these cowardly impulses that hold me down. I will trust God and not be afraid.'

(2) By prayer. Cultivate the prayer state. Quiet the soul in the presence of the Father. Let your prayers be of the most simple and most direct character, and chiefly for a share of His divine presence. This should be followed by the offering of the self, soul and body, to God to be used for His redeeming purposes; especially should such a prayer be offered immediately before commencing to preach.

(3) By self-suggestion. Relax the body, inhale a few times quickly and deeply and suggest to yourself self-control, self-possession, prudence, peace and power. The few moments which the preacher usually has to himself before beginning the delivery of his discourse are, if rightly used, of the greatest value in making his work an inspiration and a joy.

It is now time to turn to the positive help which the subconscious can afford us. Bishop Boyd Carpenter tells of a Mr.

[3] *Lectures on the Delivery of Sermons in Select Discourses*, edited by H. C. Fish and D. W. Poor.

Bucke who achieved considerable fame as a preacher, chiefly by his dependence on the richness of his subconsciousness. 'He was at his best when he took a subject and let it lay hold of his soul, and then, having selected a few clear lines of thought, let himself go. Then he would speak in a kind of rapture, like one falling into a trance and having his eyes open. The mind was detached from the circumstances of the moment. The subconscious mind was yielding up its stores of memory and illustration. Then he would fling out choice and witty sentences, the full force of which he did not himself realize at the moment. The strange part of the matter was this: he was afterwards depressed and almost despairing, complaining that he had made a mess of it and talked like a fool. The truth was that he was so much the rapt speaker that he had no power to measure what he had said or how he had said it; and yet he had uttered sentences of great power, flung out imagery, striking and suggestive, and now and again a piece of real wit. On one occasion he was preaching on Balaam's ass, and in the course of his sermon said: 'There are some people who don't believe that Balaam's ass spoke: I am of opinion that it did, and what is more, *that a great many asses have spoken since*.' Such an utterance was not prepared beforehand. It was due to the action of the subconscious mind which in such preaching is called vividly into play.'[4]

George MacDonald, poet, novelist, and preacher, affords the most remarkable illustration known to me of this mysterious, creative faculty of mind. It was my signal privilege in the early days of my ministry to hear him preach. Certainly there was nothing in the environment of the speaker to commend his utterances to the auditor. A dimly lighted, ugly, dingy chapel in the North of London, the performances of the choir anything but uplifting and exhilarating, nowhere an object on which the eye could rest with aesthetic satisfaction. But as soon as the preacher began his sermon, those things were forgotten; the quality of 'grip' manifested itself from the start. In simple, beautiful, conversational English, with an occasional lift of the voice at the bidding of a swelling emotion or of an emphatic appeal, he poured forth apparently without effort a stream of noble thoughts and gracious sentiments which woke responsive echoes in my heart. The audience gathered from all parts of the metropolis

[4] *Some Pages of My Life*, pps. 316, 317.

was held in the hollow of his hand. On the same day I had heard Dr. Westcott in Westminster Abbey, and Mr. Spurgeon in his Tabernacle, but good as their sermons were, it was George MacDonald that made an impression which the lapse of years has failed to efface. I have often wondered since what was, from a psychological point of view, the secret of his fascination. In a private letter from Dr. MacDonald's distinguished son, Dr. Greville MacDonald (which he kindly permits me to quote) he goes far to reveal the secret. 'My father,' he writes, 'did not study the subject of preaching at all, his own delivery being so unusually spontaneous. Beyond having a quiet hour with his subject on every occasion when he was to lecture or preach, he made no preparation and no notes. When I was with him in the States in 1872, I heard him lecture about forty times on Robert Burns, and I used to declare that never once did he give us the same lecture. So it was with his preaching.' Here unquestionably is an evidence of an unusual activity of the subconscious.

Most preachers will place, and rightly place, their main dependence on their conscious powers. The question is: Can they utilize the forces of the subconscious with a view to the more efficient use of their personality? The answer is: They can. First of all, when we choose a subject and allow our minds to work on it for a little, we should then turn away from conscious thinking about it for a space, hand it over to the subconscious activity and let it undergo a process of gestation. Without our being aware of it, ideas, sentiments, similes, illustrations will gather round it, and when we sit down to the work of writing the sermon we shall find our task greatly lightened. When the sermon is finished it should be worked into the very texture of the mind, so that it may become part of our subconscious activity. The best method for accomplishing this is, after the completion of the sermon and after revision and several careful readings, to relax the body, close the eyes, quiet the mind and recall very gently the main lines of thought and especially the links of connection, repeating them over and over again. When you stand in the pulpit you will be astonished and delighted at the ease and freedom which will characterize your speech. The power to enjoy this experience differs, of course, in different men, but it is possible, in a measure, to all. Here lies the secret of what has been called 'psychic power in preaching.' For want of it learned,

eloquent, polished discourses pass us by without leaving a trace upon our souls; where it energizes, a man may break all the technical rules of his art and yet prove a mighty power. There is a tremendous electric potency stored in the human soul when kept in harmony with God's will and made the channel of His vital purpose. And such a soul guided by clear intellectual perceptions of its task and moved by a powerful emotion, constitutes a psychic power which mere marshalling of logic or rhetorical art cannot produce. The imperative need of the preacher is to set free his 'electric potency' so that, thrilling with his message, the hearer may catch the contagion of his passion. But certain conditions must be obeyed as you stand up to deliver your message. First, get rid of all bodily tension. Do not clench the hand, or clutch any part of your dress. Stand not stiffly, but at ease and in a relaxed posture. This physical attitude will have a reflex influence on the mind and will contribute to an essential in all effective public speaking, that is poise of personality. As the preacher's whole being is thus free from strain, not only will the subconscious give up its treasures, but the mind will be sensitive to the impressions coming from the congregation, and that subtle interchange of thought and feeling between speaker and hearers so vital to real preaching will be sustained and developed. It is under these conditions that inspired moments visit the preacher. Then it is that there are 'uprushes from the subliminal' which carry the preacher, as the saying goes, beyond himself, that is, beyond his ordinary, normal self, and impress the hearer with the fact that he is listening to an inspired utterance. Then it is that he lets himself go, yet has himself under control; personality meets personality, soul mingles with soul, and for the moment preacher and audience are fused into absolute unity of feeling. One of the reasons of the decadence of pulpit influence to-day is the great infrequency of such an experience.

Is it necessary here to utter a word of warning? The subconscious is no substitute for hard work: it cannot produce what it does not possess. Out of nothing, nothing comes. Only that man can have a richly furnished subconsciousness who has thought, and felt, who has grappled with hard questions, and has imaginatively brooded upon the undying quests of the soul. Some men depend on the subconscious to the neglect of con-

scious and severe self-cultivation, with the consequence that they become empty sentimentalists, the creators of an emotional speech that appeals only to the weak-minded and the tearful.

2. *The Influence of the Will in Preaching.*

'The living force of the human soul brought to bear upon living souls for the sake of their transformation is the fundamental idea of preaching.'[5] Observe that this description of preaching is in terms of the *will*. This is in harmony with the modern tendency to regard the will as the primary and constitutive function of the mind. A man may have a good intelligence, a sympathetic heart and a desire to do good, but if he is deficient in will-power, his speech will lack driving force. It is the will that enables a man to project his thoughts and aspirations into the minds of others. The battle is half won as soon as the preacher resolves that the hearers must listen; but this resolution implies, of course, a forthgoing of volitional power. 'The preacher should be a man of *strong will*. A strong will is one in which powerful impulses are subject to an equally powerful self-control. The impulsive and inhibitive factors of personality should balance one another; but both must be strong to make a strong will. The greatest public speakers have been notable in this respect. Their powerful impulses enable them to stir an audience; but their equally powerful self-restraint, while making the impression of reserved force, checks unhealthy excesses. They make a balanced and proportional appeal to the emotional and intellectual faculties of their hearers. They react with great energy upon their audiences, but they react upon the *whole* nature of those under their influence . . . '[6] Individuals differ in the range of their will-power; but the fact to be emphasized is that will-power can be cultivated and strengthened. Its foundations are sound health, a well-balanced nervous system, and a disciplined mind. The centre of the will is the power of attention. Hence habits of inattention and mind-wandering sap the very basis of volitional energy. One of the best ways of strengthening the will is to attend to whatever has the right to claim your attention at the moment. It was said of Gladstone that whether it was a speech he was delivering or a game he was playing or an

[5] Beecher: *Yale Lectures*, p. 13.
[6] Gardner: *Psychology and Preaching*, p. 206.

interview he was giving, his whole personality was completely absorbed in the matter in hand, as if he had no other interest whatsoever. The activity of the will, be it remembered, is as much concerned with the compulsive ordering of the preacher's words in the pulpit as with the building of the sermon in the study. You may have an excellent sermon intellectually considered, but it will evoke a very languid assent unless driven home by vigorous psychical qualities in yourself. Your words must not only transmit thoughts, they must convey emotional energy. For genuine preaching is, at bottom, a struggle of will with will. Unless the will of the hearer is carried, the sermon is a failure. In the pulpit the preacher must gird up the loins of his soul to a life grapple with the congregation by a calm, steady pressure of the will to bring heart and mind to the acceptance of his message. The sermon must be a deed as well as a word. The preacher must *will* the good of those to whom he speaks.

3. *The Imagination in Preaching.*

A recent writer on the art of preaching classes the imaginative quality of a sermon among its lighter elements. This is to confound fancy with imagination. Fancy deals with odd or curious or superficial relations of objects. It is wayward, capricious, dividing, and plays upon the mere surface of things. Imagination is the faculty by which we are able to visualize the invisible, to present it in such concrete form that men feel it as reality. 'The imagination sees. Out of material stored in the mind it creates a living world. By its forces the Parthenon is no longer a ruin and the Greeks yet live. The imagination gives atmosphere and stimulates individual ideas. Mere facts may make a wrong impression, but imagination clothes facts with living scenes and situations and presents the hidden truth. Imagination is the basis of all figurative language. It compares object with object, identifies the unknown and the known, and creates a new whole.'[7] The main function of the preacher is to imagine unseen realities and to reveal them to others in such a way that they shall be as convincing as things seen with the bodily eye. It is only through the imagination that the emotions can be stirred. Abstractions, however lofty, cannot move the feelings. A speaker may feel deeply the truth he is expounding

[7] S. S. Curry: *Foundations of Expression*, p. 145.

he may even choke with the pressure of his emotions, and his hearers may remain calm and unmoved. Why? Because only through distinct images can the emotions be touched. The newspaper reporter knows this, and therefore he hurries over the general features of the tragic occurrence which he describes and concentrates on the sufferings of the victim and the reactions of the spectators. 'Not our logical, but our imaginative faculty is king over us,' says Carlyle. We can transmit our emotional tone to another only through the medium of imagination. Take the the subtlest or the most sublime thought, present it in pictorial form, or in the guise of a striking illustration, and even the untrained, average man will understand and feel.

The mental images which form, so to say, the preacher's stock in trade are of various types corresponding to the senses affected, such as visual, auditory, motor, tactile images. It is important for the preacher to discover the prevailing cast of his mental imagery. The great poets and orators use frequently the imagery of the various types mentioned, but at the head of the list for frequency stand visual images. A student of Tennyson has discovered that in a thousand lines of his 'Idylls of the King,' the poet used eighty-three visual, forty-eight auditory, one motor and seven tactile images. I have examined a sermon by Robertson and one by Brooks, each consisting of about four thousand words, and have found that Robertson used thirteen visual, four auditory, three motor and three tactile images, whereas Brooks uses fifteen visual, seven auditory, eight motor and two tactile images. Rich as is the Englishman in imagery, the American is still richer. It is now known that visual images make the most general appeal.

> 'The business of the drama must appear
> In action or description. What we hear
> With slower passion to the heart proceeds
> Than when an audience views the very deeds.'
>
> (Horace: *Ars Poetica.*)

Hence the advice to give the teacher is equally good for the preacher. 'Work for the picture.' All the influential preachers whose sermons are available have been characterized by a strong picture-forming faculty. Especially to-day, when millions witness moving picture plays daily and are unconsciously acquiring thereby a disposition of mind which makes them impatient of truth that is not vividly set forth in pictorial form, must the

preacher translate principles and doctrines into scenes, situations, visions. Anything that cannot be so translated cannot be of vital import.

Several practical conclusions follow. The preacher should aim at gaining as large a stock of visual images as possible, but he must not confine himself to these. Different forms of imagery relieve the monotony produced by the use of a single form. The imagination can be developed. The preacher should cultivate the power to recall what he has experienced, in visual, concrete images, and he can do this only by close, concentrated attention. Imagination is a universal possession of humanity in a more or less degree. Geniuses possess it in an abnormal degree. Bunyan and Newman saw the abstractions of the spiritual world in concrete forms 'like men walking in the street.' Special gifts make the formation of mental images easier for one man than for another. The fact remains, however, that valuable results can be obtained by resolution and work. How is this form to be described? (1) By keen observance of the beautiful things of nature, and the choicest products of the plastic and pictorial art. (2) By close study of poetry and drama. The poet and the dramatist from the nature of their craft use a language which is higher, more emotional, more intense than that of ordinary prose. If they would succeed they must deal in pictures and visions, and in suggestive hints that spur the imagination of the reader. Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Shelley, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning, Matthew Arnold, and among the minor bards William Watson, Francis Thompson and Rudyard Kipling, are of special value to the preacher. There is another still deeper reason why the proclaimer of the Gospel should steep his mind in the best poetry. The late Professor Denney wrote to a clerical friend: 'It was delightful to hear that you were going in for reading the poets through. The longer I live the more I feel the truth of Aristotle's doctrine that poetry is more philosophical than history; it is a higher kind of truth, and indeed the only form in which the highest kind of truth can get even imperfect expression.' Fiction, too, though in a much less degree, helps the creative function of the imagination. But it has been pointed out that it leaves the reader too passive; the scenes and situations depicted by the novelist pass before the reader's eyes; he is a spectator and enjoys the pictures as they pass, but he is not

forced to contribute anything to stir up his imaginative powers in order to see and utilize what else would escape him. Fiction has its value for the preacher which will be indicated elsewhere, but there are better instruments for the stimulation of his creative powers.

4. *The Emotions in Preaching.*

What is the place of Emotion in preaching? This is a question with which the man who preaches must come to terms, if his work is to be crowned with success. In the prevailing reaction of the pulpit against vapid sentimentalism, we are in danger of falling into the other extreme of over-intellectualism. Dr. A. E. Garvie rightly remarks: 'The failure of a great deal of preaching to be fully effective is due to its being too intellectualistic. The preacher is conveying only ideas and ideals from his own to another's reason and conscience, but he is not communicating the passion or enthusiasm he himself may feel. Without weak sentimentalism and violent emotionalism effective preaching does demand that there shall be warmth as well as light.'[8] The sermon must be addressed not exclusively to this or that function of the soul, but to the whole moral and religious personality. But it cannot be so addressed, unless it comes from the entire consecrated personality of the preacher. This accounts for the fact that an old sermon which once had a powerful appeal, no longer meets with any response. The old ideas no longer call forth in the preacher's own heart the same sincere and deep feeling. On the other hand, the emotions must be controlled by reason and intelligence. Says S. T. Coleridge: 'Every attempt in a sermon to cause emotion, except as the consequence of an impression made on the reason and understanding or the will, I hold to be fanatical and sectarian.'[9] The uneducated man, owing to the unchecked quality of his emotional life, can produce by suggestion striking emotional manifestations in others, whereas the cultivated man whose emotions are under the control of his intellect will produce less excitement on his hearers, but he will make a deeper and more vital impression. The culture of the religious life should tend more, not to suppress the emotions, still less to kill them, but to control them and crystallize them through more activity.[10]

[8] *The Christian Preacher*, p. 12. [9] *Table Talk*, p. 203.
[10] See Gardner: *Psychology of Preaching*, pp. 288, 289.

If we consult the great orators, we shall find that they unanimously concur in holding that emotion is essential to the highest oratory. 'I frankly confess,' says Cicero, 'that I owe my success much less to my own efforts than to the force of the passions which agitate me when I speak in public. It was this force which enabled me to reduce Hortensius to silence, and to close the mouth of Catiline.' And again: 'It is not possible for the hearer to grieve or hate or fear or be moved to commiseration unless the emotions which the speaker wishes to communicate are deeply impressed upon himself and stamped on his own bosom with characters of fire.' So well do great actors know this fact, that in order to arouse in themselves the feeling which they wish to convey to the audience, they work up the emotions before appearing on the stage by visualizing the particular scene in which they are to take part or in listening to the dialogue which the other actors are carrying on. If we turn to the great preachers, we hear their united testimony that they must be touched themselves before they can touch others. Dr. A. V. G. Allen, writing of Phillips Brooks, says: 'He first opened his soul to the influence of the truth which was to constitute his message, devising the most forcible method in order to make it appeal to his own heart. He studied its effect upon himself before studying how to reach his congregation.' Read any sermon by J. H. Jowett, or Beecher, or Robertson or W. E. Orchard, whose preaching is pre-eminently intellectual, and you will find an emotional quality which gives the truth enunciated driving energy. The emotions of joy and sorrow, pathos and awe dispose the mind to accept the ideas and ideals of the sermon, and open up a way to win the motives and so control the will. Without deep feeling on the part of the speaker, it is impossible for him to impart to the discourse that accent of conviction which is the secret of all successful preachers.

Some preachers are ashamed of enthusiasm or fervour in their delivery. It may be that this is the reaction against an excessive sentimentalism which repels all manly minds. But the abuse of a good thing does not forbid its use. The absence of any expression of emotion leaves upon the hearers the impression that the speaker is discharging a perfunctory duty in which he is not greatly interested. And this, of course, is a foolish mistake. We can easily detect the false emotion, the emotion

that is aroused or is allowed to run free from restraint and show itself in declamatory tones. Avoid as you would a plague what is known as 'tears in the voice' or an artificial tremolo. It only irks and frets the hearer. But there is a noble emotion generated by noble ideas which every preacher ought to cultivate. This emotional spontaneity, born of great ideas by which the speaker has become possessed, will give a touch of passion to his speech in which his entire personality will be revealed to work its effect upon the congregation. Moreover, the great mass of men are impatient of abstract reasoning. Mr. William Sunday knows this elementary fact, hence he can crowd his mammoth tent with an intensely interested audience of thousands whom he sways from tears to laughter at the bidding of his own powerful emotions. There is a reservoir of potential energy within the average man which the popular evangelist knows how to tap, but which the pastoral preacher neglects with great loss to his effectiveness. After all, it is not mere thought he has to communicate, it is *vital force*.

A few practical hints may be added.

1. Do not 'tear a passion to tatters'—which means, do not rant and declaim, do not permit bodily movements beyond what is appropriate for that degree of emotion which you feel at the time.

2. Do not make any gestures with the arms as expressing emotion, without any accompanying movement of the muscles of the face. Some preachers never change the facial expression, while they use freely arms and hands. And yet facial expression is the first and most important manifestation of emotion.

3. Do not begin a sermon with any expression of emotion which implies pain or sorrow. The audience is not yet in sympathy with you, and is more or less critical. You must win them by an emotion born of an agreeable thought.

4. While strong convictions deeply felt are essential to the preacher, do not fall into the sin of overcharging your sermons with personal conviction so that you give the auditors the feeling that you are arrogating solely to yourself the merit of possessing any convictions at all. A sympathetic imagination which identifies you with your hearers will make this fault impossible.

THE MESSAGE OF WILLIAM LAW

WILLIAM LAW was as strange a combination of High Churchman, Puritan, and Mystic as we could imagine the eighteenth century—that age of rational enlightenment—ever producing. In some of his views (as to clerical celibacy, for instance) he went further than most of our modern Anglo-Catholics; his Puritanism at times appeared to exclude almost every occupation except earning one's daily bread, ministering to the needs of the poor, and the practices of religious observance; and, for his Mysticism, though it never led him consciously to break with the creeds and ordinances of his Church, yet from the time when, at the age of fifty, he became acquainted with the writings of Jacob Boehme, he never ceased to be an enthusiastic disciple and interpreter of the little shoemaker of Silesia. On the top of all this, in his quiet personal life, he was a true saint, beloved, in spite of his austerity, by nearly all who came into personal contact with him.

Law's outward career may be sketched with ease. He was born in 1686, eight years before the great Voltaire, the son of a prosperous grocer of the small village of King's Cliffe in Northamptonshire. He was well educated, took a degree at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, entered Anglican orders, and would probably have remained most of his life under the shadow of the University, had not the change of dynasty taken place. It was in keeping with his extreme conscientiousness, buttressed by the traditional doctrine of passive obedience to the ancient line of kings, that Law found himself unable to take the necessary oaths of allegiance to the Hanoverian sovereign. He was thus precluded from getting any position in either the University or the Church, and, after some years of obscurity in London, he became a private tutor in a wealthy household at Putney. His pupil was the father of the historian Gibbon. While in London he came into touch with the young John Wesley, who was at first deeply influenced (as were the Methodists generally) by Law's great treatise, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. Later on Wesley, who had strong objections to mysticism, became Law's respectful but outspoken opponent.

On the death of his patron, the elder Gibbon, the gentle clergyman, now fifty-four years of age, returned to his native village of King's Cliffe. Here he was joined by two devoted disciples, Mrs. Hutcheson, a rich widow, and Miss Hester Gibbon, the historian's aunt. For some twenty years (until his death in 1761) these two ladies kept house for Law, shared his daily routine, his devotions, and his philanthropies. The latter were most extensive, for the three friends lived a life of unostentatious self-denial, never saving a penny and treating their own household as just one of a number of poor families to be relieved by the income at their disposal.

Law was an indefatigable reader and a voluminous writer. His collected works (all on themes closely connected with religion) run into nine closely-printed volumes and cover the last thirty-five years of his life. Law deliberately avoided all direct autobiographical touches, but it is intensely interesting to trace the development of his personality and his thought in these volumes. He was magnificently gifted as a controversialist, with a faculty of pitiless and scrupulously polite dissection of his theological opponent which must have been irritating in the extreme. Combined with this is a rich vein of irony and a keen and almost terrible humour in dealing with the issues of life and eternity. It is these characteristics which make it possible for our generation to read with interest Law's controversial writings —the *Bangorian Letters*, the *Case of Reason*, the *Confutation of Warburton*, even though the method of treatment has largely lost its appeal and the arguments seem sometimes to be little more than logic-chopping.

In the *Christian Perfection* and the *Serious Call* we are in a different atmosphere. Here we find Law rising to tremendous heights of prophetic austerity and passion as he reveals to an irreligious age the extent to which it has become unfaithful to the teaching and example of Christ. He drives his points home with a number of inimitable character sketches, brimming over with his grim and incisive humour. This, for instance, from his *Christian Perfection*:

> 'Patronus is fond of a clergyman that understands music, painting, statuary, and architecture. He is an enemy to the dissenters, and loves the Church of England because of the stateliness and beauty of its buildings: he never comes to the Sacrament, but will go forty miles

to see a fine altar-piece. He goes to Church when there is a new tune to be heard, but never had any more serious thoughts about salvation than about flying. If you visit him when he is dying, you will hear his dying thoughts upon architecture.'

In the *Serious Call* we find quite a number of much more developed studies of this kind, and alongside of them three or four entirely harmonious pictures of ideal characters—Miranda, the bountiful lady, Paternus, the good father; Ouranius, the devoted parish priest. The weakness of these two books is the narrowness of content which is given to the Christian life, in which no legitimate place is found for the love of nature or art, for the pursuits of scholarship or of politics. Still, Law was not strictly an ascetic; he believed that a constant round of devotional and philanthropic activities, with little or no scope for innocent diversions, ought to appear to others, as it did to himself, as both the most truly reasonable and the most comfortable form of earthly existence. I know of no more convincing treatments of such subjects as the love of one's neighbour and intercessory prayer than are contained in the *Serious Call*. It is not surprising that many Christians have, like the great Dr. Johnson, owed to the book their conversion, or one stage of it.

In one of the last of his controversial works Law wrote that the bent of his mind led him to wish that 'his pen should be wholly employed in setting forth the infinite love of God to mankind in Christ Jesus,' and this great theme in a highly mystical setting is the one engrossing subject of his later works. The bitterness of controversy dies almost completely away, the dramatic element is continued, but without the vein of irony, in the graceful dialogue form of three of his noblest treatises. The short, pithy, pointed paragraphs give place to long flowing periods of great rhythmical beauty, many of them full of tender and passionate eloquence. One seems to be watching the gradual burning up of all dross and disharmony in the flames of the Divine Love, with which the writer yearns to be united. Law has adopted a good deal of the obscure and fantastic symbolism of Boehme, but it is only here and there that this element need perplex the reader, and he has modified very substantially both the vagaries and the harshness of his master. It is surprising what a high level of interest and charm is maintained in the varied treatments of the Fall and the New Birth, which cover

the last twenty-three years of Law's life—whether it be in the *Christian Regeneration*, summarizing his mysticism in its simplest form; in the *Appeal*, perhaps the most comprehensive of his works; in the *Spirit of Prayer*, reprinted by Quakers and others as a devotional tract; in the delightful dialogues of the *Way to Divine Knowledge*, ostensibly a preparation for the study of Jacob Boehme, but much more than this; or in the still more delightful dialogues of the *Spirit of Love*, which sets forth the gospel of pure love in its profoundest form. The concluding volume of *Letters* breathes a similar spirit.

It is this crowning phase of Law's thought which ought, in my opinion, to receive our most earnest attention to-day. For it provides the theological justification for a continual extension of the method of overcoming evil with good, and for the sweeping away of the punitive and retributive element in our conceptions of justice, human and divine. In the following paragraphs I have attempted to summarize very briefly the heart of Law's constantly reiterated teaching as regards the relation of God to human sin and suffering.

Law's cardinal doctrine was that 'God is Love, yea all Love, and so all Love, that nothing but Love can come from Him.' 'God,' he says, 'has but one nature and intent towards all creation, which is, to pour forth the riches and sweetness of His divine perfections upon everything that is capable of them, and according to its capacity to receive them.'

From this it follows that it is utterly mistaken to regard God as 'calling for justice to His offended sovereignty and inflicting pains and punishments suitable to the greatness of His just indignation and anger at the disobedient creature.' Indeed, in the nature of things there cannot be 'from eternity to eternity' a single spark of wrath or resentment or desire for vengeance in God. For vengeance is a 'stirring up of evil' in one that desires it, and 'all wrath is disorder and can only exist in disordered and sinning creatures.' 'Wrath can no more be in God Himself, than Hell can be in Heaven.'

How then are we to account for the miseries and pain and loss that fall on the wrong-doer both here and hereafter? These things, Law says, are just the inevitable consequences of the wrong-doing (the 'unravelling of the results of sin,' as a modern writer has termed them), they are necessarily implied and

wrapped up in the act and nature of sin, just 'as blindness is implied in the extinction of the eyes.'

Man's original nature was angelic and divine, and, being divine, there was in it necessarily free-will, *i.e.*, the possibility of error and sin. Goodness is impossible without a will that is free. God's will, Law insists, is perfectly free (although there are many things he 'cannot' do), so men, who are made in His image, are free too—free to 'will and work with God and partake of a Divine happiness,' free also to separate themselves from Him.

All sin is just separation from God and from obedience to His Will, and the placing of self, instead of God, at the centre of the soul and its desires. By so doing the fire and strength of a man's nature, which, while united to God, issues in love and joy, becomes, when broken off from God, 'wrath and darkness.' ('Fire,' it should be explained, in Law's and Boehme's metaphysics is the basis of the spiritual universe.) This dark wrath indicates a state of corrupt and steadily increasing degeneration. A man in this state gradually opens within himself Hell and all its terrors. For God did not make Hell. Hell is nothing more than 'the painful state of the creature for want of its own proper righteousness, just as sickness is the painful state of the creature for want of its own proper health.'

God is only the cause of this pain in the sense that He gave men free will and that He ordained the moral law of cause and effect. It is therefore, says Law, in one sense correct to assert that it is just man's original divine and perfect nature (in other words, God immanent in him) which is 'his tormentor, his plague, that continually exercises its *good* vengeance upon him, till it truly regains its first state in him.' God, it is true, rules and governs the distresses of sinners just 'as He governs the madness of storms and tempests.' But, even when He allows harsh things to happen, He is like a physician 'who seeks nothing but the perfect recovery of his patient.' Throughout the history of the race, there has never been anything in the slightest degree punitive or vindictive in God's dealings with man.

In language which rises at times to almost passionate eloquence, Law shows how the Incarnation and the Atonement alike represent simply the high-water mark of the Divine Love

to man; in so doing traversing altogether the theories of the Atonement current in both Catholic and Protestant theologies:

> There is no Wrath that stands between God and us, but what is awakened in the dark Fire of our fallen Nature; and to quench this Wrath, and not His own, God gave His only begotten Son to be made Man. God has no more Wrath in Himself now, than He had before the Creation, when He had only Himself to love. The precious Blood of His Son was not poured out to pacify Himself (who in Himself had no Nature towards Man but Love), but it was poured out to quench the Wrath and Fire of the fallen Soul, and kindle in it a Birth of Light and Love.' [1]

> 'View every part of our Redemption from Adam's first sin to the Resurrection of the Dead, and you will find nothing but successive mysteries of that first Love, which created Angels and Men. All the mysteries of the Gospel are only so many marks and proofs of God's desiring to make His Love triumph, in the removal of sin and disorder from all Nature and Creature.' [2]

The most amazing feature of these doctrines of Law is that he was able to discover them and to hold them with the most absolute certitude though burdened with a theory of Scripture which amounts to verbal inspiration. For it has usually been taken for granted by readers of the Bible that its writers, particularly of course the Old Testament writers, regard God as very capable of righteous anger and as continually punishing sinners in the sternest fashion. For the courageous and ingenious manner in which Law essays the interpretation of such passages I must refer the reader to the Second Part of the *Spirit of Love*.[3]

Law has further the great merit of perceiving that we cannot attribute to the Deity any particular human quality without sooner or later justifying the exercise of such a quality in ourselves; for we are built in the image of God, and He acts through us. Thus, discussing the ordinary interpretation of the passage in *Romans* xii. 19, where Paul quotes from *Deuteronomy* the words, 'Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord,' Law declares boldly that this cannot possibly mean that the desire for vengeance is a quality of the Divine nature, for, if so, 'then vengeance would belong to every child of God that was truly born of Him, or he could not be perfect as His Father in heaven is perfect.'

[1] *The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration.* Sect. 24.

[2] *The Spirit of Prayer.* Part I, p. 36.

[3] And also Letters IV and XXV.

'Law,' writes his biographer, Canon Overton (doubtless with some pardonable exaggeration), 'took the Sermon on the Mount quite literally, and in every action of his life no less than in his *Serious Call* he showed that he was bent on carrying out every precept of it thoroughly without the slightest compromise.' For he felt that the precepts of the Sermon express not only the perfection of human character and conduct, but the activities of God Himself as manifested both in the life of Jesus and in the natural and spiritual world generally. It was for this reason that he took, for instance, the full Quaker view of the unlawfulness of all war to the Christian, and in a warlike and patriotic age was most courageously outspoken on this unpopular theme.

It must, of course, be remembered that Law lived the sheltered life of a student, holding no public office, in the peaceful environment of a quiet country village, with admiring disciples who provided for all his very modest needs, while there remained constantly a superfluity by which he was enabled literally to give to all that asked him (his home seems to have become the rendez-vous of half the tramps in Britain), and that therefore his loyalty to the strict law of love was never severely tested. Still, the consistent impression he made upon those of his contemporaries who had personal contact with him encourages the belief that he would have gone very far indeed towards the carrying out of this law, had his lot been cast in stormier times and a life of action been imposed upon him by necessity or duty. Men who have been the pioneers in proclaiming true rules and principles of human action have not seldom been prevented by one reason or another, from putting those principles into practice in any convincing way. To do so is the privilege of humbler men and women who owe enlightenment and peace of soul to a Discoverer of Truth such as William Law undoubtedly was.

STEPHEN HOBHOUSE.

NOTE.—The most convenient edition of William Law's works is the reprint (in nine volumes) made for G. Moreton in 1893. A good introduction to the study of his writings is the volume of selections by Dr. Alexander Whyte entitled *Characters and Characteristics of William Law*. The best critical studies of Law are to be found in Overton's *Life of William Law* in Professor Caroline Spurgeon's essay in Vol. IX of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (or, more briefly, in her *Mysticism in English Literature*), and in Dean Inge's essay in *Studies in the English Mystics*. It is only in Dean Inge's appreciation that any adequate notice is given to the teachings emphasized in the foregoing article.

LORD HALIFAX ON THE ROMAN PRIMACY*

By the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A., author of *Studies in Modernism*, etc.

THE Anglo-Catholic Party is fortunate in its leading lay representative; I am not sure that one might not omit the word 'lay.' Lord Halifax's theory of the Church is, of course, not ours. But it has a great past; it appeals strongly to certain temperaments; given the premisses, it follows from them inevitably; it is religious; and it is courteously expressed. This is why he is listened to with respect by those who differ widely from him. He is, in some respects, a survival of an older world.

> 'I think there can be no one now alive who is more competent to speak for what is called the Anglo-Catholic body. No one has been more intimately concerned in the later history of the Oxford Movement than I have. I believe I have known everybody and everything connected with it, from Cardinal Newman and Dr. Pusey downwards, for some sixty years.'

Nor has time chilled his early enthusiasm; the dull virtues of middle age have never formed part of his equipment; he is still in the front of the fight. Probably no one but he could have induced a man of so different a type and such different traditions as the present Archbishop of Canterbury to throw his ægis over the Malines Conversations; or so mixed a body as the English Church Union to listen patiently to such a statement as that

> 'unprejudiced consideration of Holy Scripture and of the facts of history establishes strong ground for believing that it was part of the Divine intention to impose some special function of jurisdiction upon the Holy See.'

This conviction was the key to the writer's recent address to the Anglo-Catholic Congress, printed as an appendix to the present pamphlet. The most memorable feature of this allocution was that it was delivered in the presence of a considerable number of bishops; and that these venerable persons gave it the equivocal assent of silence: 'Assur also is joined unto them, and have holpen the children of Lot.' That the pronouncement should have fluttered the dovecotes of Anglicanism only shows

* Reunion and the Roman Primacy. By Viscount Halifax. (A. R. Mowbray. 1925. 1/-.)

the muddle-headedness of English thinking. On no other basis could Malines, however indirectly, approach Lambeth, or Lambeth Malines. But '*some* special function of jurisdiction' will not satisfy the Vatican. The precise nature of the Papal jurisdiction has been laid down in terms which offer no loopholes; its logical consequences have been defined, and imposed as matter of faith upon the Church.

2. 'Pour faire l'histoire d'une religion il faut ne plus y croire, mais il faut y avoir cru.' This is peculiarly the case with Roman Catholicism. Whig as he was, Macaulay describes it as 'that august and fascinating superstition'—accentuating all three terms. We live in a less virile age: there are few Englishmen, probably still fewer English clergymen, however dignified, who can speak of it with anything remotely resembling accuracy. When, in particular, they discuss Reunion, as they call it, they expose their complete ignorance of the situation, and of the very meaning of the terms which they employ. Catholicism is tied hand and foot by its past: 'meaner Churches,' it has been said 'may repent and amend; but, for Rome, reform is suicide.' To the Roman Catholic, dogma is not a variable formula which can be canvassed over a Round Table, but a fixed quantity whose substance and form are guaranteed by an infallible teacher; the Church is not 'the blessed company of all faithful people,' but Christians in communion with the See of Rome. Lord Halifax sees this—not, indeed, clearly; for he ventures on the curious statement that 'the Roman Church makes no claim to be the whole Church'; but more clearly than the Bishops who bear him company. This is why his pronouncements on Reunion are, approximately at least, relevant; while theirs beat the air.

3. He speaks, he admits, for himself only, not for those who represent the Church of England at Malines:

> 'I certainly do not express the opinions of Bishop Gore; what the Bishop of Truro and Dr. Kidd may think, I do not know. I am sure that the Archbishop of Canterbury would dissent from my words, and from the interpretation which might be put upon them.'

But the future, he believes, is with him:

> 'I do not think that I am bound to conceal my own opinions or to hide convictions vitally affecting the cause of reunion which, though they may not be accepted to-day, will assuredly be generally accepted to-morrow.'

By whom? Scarcely by the English people; the tide sets strongly in another direction. By the Anglo-Catholic Party? Possibly, and even probably; there is a law of gravitation in these things. And the same *kind* of proof which is advanced for the divine origin, or right, of episcopacy is advanced with at least as much force for that of the Papacy: the temperament which regards a bishop with religious awe regards the Pope with greater; his magic is the more powerful of the two. 'After all, the road is very largely Roman,' says one who has since found it entirely so: we cannot use an argument as long as it suits our purpose and drop it when it leads to inconvenient conclusions; we must go where the thought leads. But the fallacy of logic is the most dangerous of the fallacies; the more logically we reason from erroneous or loosely constructed premisses, the further we find ourselves from the truth. Ultramontanism is logical enough. But it is a *reductio ad absurdum* of Christianity. When we test its foundations, their inadequacy is palpable: the superstructure is imposing; but it is built on sand.

4. Lord Halifax would, no doubt, disclaim the charge of Ultramontanism; 'the claims of Boniface VIII to the possession of both swords—the temporal as well as the spiritual—must not (he tells us) be unduly pressed.' The disclaimer is temperate: but his concessions, large as they are from the standpoint of the Anglican formularies, whose position is that 'the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England,' amount to little more than the Gallicanism of Bossuet or Du Pin. But Gallicanism, like Conciliarism and Febronianism, was all along disavowed by Rome; and, at least since the Vatican Council, is a condemned heresy. There was, indeed, a time when it seemed possible that the absolutism of Rome might have been replaced by some such system; the century which witnessed the climax of the Papal usurpation witnessed also the beginning of its decay. The *Unam Sanctam* over-reached itself; in the period of the reforming Councils—Pisa, Constance, Basel—the foundations of the prison-house were shaken. But the hopes raised were illusory: the Church was Sindbad; the Papacy was the Old Man of the Sea. Conciliarism proved impracticable; Rome was in possession; dynastic and political interests worked in the long run on her side. The predominence of the House of Hapsburg; the

rise of the Jesuit Order; the Council of Trent; the reaction from the Reformation, and later from the Revolution—these things strengthened and stereotyped the Papal monarchy, to which the Definition of Infallibility (1870) put the coping-stone. The minority bishops at the Vatican Council have been blamed for their cowardice; 'nous avons fait une grande faute,' said a Hungarian bishop to Dupanloup as they left Rome. They were not heroes; but it is difficult to see what they could have done. Things had gone too far to be mended. Their respective Governments refused to intervene; they themselves were pledged by their past, and by the oath imposed on them at their consecration. It was submission, or schism: and, had they chosen the latter, not a sacristan would have followed them; it would have been magnificent, but not war. Prince Hohenlohe's memorandum of April, 1871, gives the key to the situation.[1] Neither of the two brothers, the Cardinal or the future Chancellor, regarded the Council as either free or œcumenical. But they saw no future for the Old Catholic body—which Döllinger never joined. Should the Church in the end reform itself and disavow the Vatican definition, well and good. If not, it was doomed to fall; and its place would be taken by some other form of religion. Meanwhile they waited upon events; as, no doubt, some still do.

5. The Roman Catholic Church, because it is primarily a force rather in politics than in religion, has a singular power of covering its tracks; it forgets, and succeeds in making even its opponents forget, the more inconvenient features of its past. The scandals which accompanied the Vatican Council are ancient history; but infallibility remains a weapon in the Papal armoury. Who remembers the Pontifical Acts of 1907? But they are permanent engines of persecution in the Church's hand. There is an impression among Anglicans and other English Protestants that the crusade against learning associated with the name of Pius X is a thing of the past. It is not so. M. Loisy's recently published *L'Eglise et la France* is conclusive on this point: Popes pass; the Papacy remains. The systematic process of delation continues; walls have ears. Even under Pius X nothing quite so scandalous took place as the condemnation of the Sulpician Manuel Biblique; the Inquisition and the Index

[1] *Hohenlohe Memoirs*, ii, 49.

now united, 'ne sont plus qu'un seul ministère de l'ignorance publique dans l'Eglise romaine.' The lot of the more educated clergy, in particular, is pitiable. 'Malheur à ceux qui, bien instruits des questions, sont, ou se croient, obligés d'écrire sur ces matières de critique religieuse. L'epée de Damoclès est suspendue sur leurs têtes.'[2] A secession from the ranks of the Anglo-Catholics would strengthen the least rational elements in Romanism: from the first, as Bishop Thirlwall reminds us, converts to Rome have, with few exceptions, attached themselves to the straitest sect of their new religion:

> 'These modern proselytes to Rome, even while they remain within our pale and minister at our altars, have rushed into an extreme from which many of the most sincere, pious, and enlightened members of that communion have shrunk.'[3]

They continue to do so. Gallicanism is likely to prove no more than a temporary refuge for those to whom it appears that

> 'there cannot be a rigorous delimitation of the rights of the Papacy and of the Episcopate in regard of one another,'

and that

> 'we naturally expect to find that this Primacy (that of Rome), within the limits prescribed by our Lord, would go on developing and enlarging according to the Church's requirements and needs.'

The Jesuit would, indeed, be exacting who would ask for more.

6. Lord Halifax sees what Cardinal Newman calls the 'antiquarian' question of Anglican orders out of perspective. The 'porrection of the instruments'—*i.e.*, the paten and chalice—prescribed by the Bull of Eugenius IV *Ad Armenos*, might, he thinks, be accepted by the Anglican clergy; as the bishops at the last Lambeth Conference 'stated their willingness to accept such a rectification of their orders as might facilitate their recognition by the Roman Church.' But 'it is impossible for Anglicans to consent to anything which, in their eyes, would seem to invalidate the orders conferred by the English Episcopate.' The Bishop of London goes further: disbelief in these orders is, he tells us, the only sufficient reason for secession to Rome. Divested of rhetoric, it is difficult to see what this means. The orders of the Eastern Churches are undoubted;

[2] *L'Eglise et la France*, p. 181.
[3] *Charges*, vol. i, p. 48.

but Rome demands, and receives, the submission of their adherents. What makes a Church Catholic, in the European sense of the word, is not the possession of orders, but communion with Rome. The question which persons meditating secession have to consider is the validity, not of Anglican orders, but of the Papal claims. If they are convinced of these, there is no alternative to submission, whatever their opinion as to Anglican orders: on the other hand, a man may hold, with the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, that these orders are, and have always been, *irritas atque omnino nullas*, but no priest could receive him unless he accepted the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope. The question of orders is a side-issue; that of the Papacy is essential, the rock on which the Church is built. I shall not, I hope, be supposed to be over-stating the Roman position for controversial purposes; no *probatus auctor* would accept a lesser claim.

7. It is a curious Anglican delusion that English and Continental Roman Catholics differ on this point. What is true is that the former are better acquainted with the situation. The Conciliabulum of Malines does not commend itself to them; nor are they alone in regarding overtures in the direction of Corporate Reunion with suspicion: enthusiasts, they think, see the Church of England as their imagination pictures it, not as it is. With the best faith in the world on both sides, a certain refraction is inevitable. A Latin Catholic associates non-Roman Christianity with the baldness of the Huguenot *temple*. He visits England; if he is properly introduced, he receives a warm welcome from friendly Anglo-Catholics; he is taken to St. Mary's, Graham Street, to Mirfield, to East Grinstead, to the Pusey House. He finds, to his amazement, a liturgy indistinguishable from the Mass, the Confessional, the reserved Sacrament, the rite of Benediction, the religious life. He is impressed, touched, transported—can one wonder at it? Like the Queen of Sheba at the court of Solomon, there is no more spirit in him. The half was not told him! Our Anglican Jerusalem exceeds the fame that he had heard. He sees what is put before him; and his natural conclusion is, 'Here is a religion Catholic in all but name.' He does not know that he is overlooking the negative instances, and so taking a part for

the whole. Human nature is human nature: we cannot wonder that this is irritating to English Roman Catholics who (except, of course, the converts) are the sons of martyrs, and feel, like the elder brother in the parable, that the welcome of the imperfectly penitent prodigal is being overdone. The practical wisdom of Rome may be trusted to redress the balance. Meanwhile, urbanity is not a virtue of the Anglo-Roman body. Archbishop Benson compared Cardinal Vaughan to Rabshakeh; though, in view of *The Church Times*, we are not in a position to throw stones. But the medium through which enthusiasts see the facts distorts them. Enthusiasm is so rare and so attractive a quality that it is an ungrateful task to seem to throw cold water upon it. The greater, however, the enthusiasm, the greater the need of discounting the statements of enthusiasts and submitting them to the acid test of reality. In 1896 the then Archbishop of Canterbury expressed himself in this sense in a letter to Lord Halifax:

> 'I am afraid that you have lived for years so exclusively with one set of thinkers, and entered so entirely into the usages of one class of churches, that you have not before you the state of religious feeling and activity in England with the completeness with which anyone attempting to adjust the relations between Churches ought to have the phenomena of his own side before his eyes.'[4]

8. Since then things have advanced; there was 'a little corner of rationality' in the Church of England which seems to be obscured or eclipsed to-day. Can any serious person suppose that Rome is going back on three General Councils? and, what is even more inconceivable, upon the traditional policy of the Holy See for more than a thousand years? And for what? To pick fruit to-day which will fall into her lap to-morrow; to attract fish who offer themselves to the angler and are ready to swallow the hook bare. Such fish, it may be said, are few. Perhaps: but their number is probably better known to the Roman than to the Anglican authorities; and the smaller it is the less disposition there will be to offer terms. But while the policy associated with the Malines meetings neither has, nor can have, any effect on the Church of Rome, it has much on the Church of England. For there are two theologies among us: one which has an answer to every question; another which sees 'as in a

[4] *Life of Archbishop Benson*, p. 511.

glass darkly' and has taught its tongue to say 'I do not know.' The latter is at an immense disadvantage; there is nothing which the uneducated—who are found in all classes—resent as much as the limitations of knowledge. 'Where was the Garden of Eden?' one is sometimes asked; and the reply, 'In the imagination of early mankind,' does not satisfy the inquirer's thirst for information; the exact latitude and longitude are required. To how many certainty means more than truth! And to-day, as in the first age of the Church,

> 'the decline of ancient prejudice exposes a numerous portion of mankind to the danger of a very painful and comfortless situation. A state of scepticism and suspense may amuse a few inquisitive minds. But so urgent on the vulgar is the necessity of believing that the fall of any system of mythology will probably be succeeded by the rise of some other mode of superstition.'[5]

Here is the explanation of the recrudescence of superstition in and outside the Churches which characterizes our generation. We have seen those who reject an infallible Bible take refuge in an infallible Church; and those who repudiate both fall victims to pseudo-scientific quackeries whose fallaciousness is transparent, or a prey to occultism in its most debased forms.

9. Here is the opportunity of those who fish in troubled waters. The Catholic propaganda in this country, Roman and Anglican, is energetic, and with persons of a certain temperament and on a certain level of culture, effective. It has transformed the Church of England. And this transformation may go further; though the further it goes the more obviously the Church becomes a denomination, actuated by denominational motives and worked on denominational lines. How far Anglicanism, however mediaevalized, can meet the requirements of 'the natural man,' who (in Sohm's phrase) 'is a born Catholic,' remains to be seen. Were it not for the competition of the Church of Rome, it might pass muster; but the presence of this Church is a standing note of interrogation to its claims. For there are weak points in the Anglican pedigree. To most of us they are sufficiently meaningless; but, to those who attach weight to what Jewel dispassionately calls 'sees and successions,' they are vital.[6] The head of the family, the Pope, re-

[5] *Gibbon*, ch. xv.

[6] *Apology for the Church of England.*

pudiates the connection; and the Church in communion with him, *i.e.*, Western Christendom as a whole, follows suit. In the face of this the appeal of Anglicanism to authority is undermined. It becomes matter of argument; and a verdict of Not Proven is not one upon which faith can rest. Those who follow the Roman controversy—a controversy not without a certain psychological interest—will have noticed that less is now heard than was the case a generation ago of such technical points as orders, jurisdiction, the validity of the Sacraments, even of Papal supremacy and infallibility. The ground taken is more general. Protestantism, it is urged, is provincial; Rome European. One controversialist associates Catholicism with Latin as opposed to Teutonic civilization—during the war this was an effective argument—another couples it with democracy and beer. It is, however, important to remember that there is, and can be, no withdrawal of the former claims. Hence an element of uncertainty about Anglicanism, however advanced. It is δόξα, not ἐπιστήμη: the initial doubt remains. Nothing short of infallibility can remove it; and there is only one Church which claims infallibility: to do so is at once the strength and the weakness of Rome. In his well-known lines 'To the Infallible,' one who knew human nature well describes that 'wish to believe' which for some is a temperamental necessity which can neither be resisted nor controlled:

'Old Angler, what device is thine
To draw my pleasant friends from me?
Thou fishest with a silken line,
Not the coarse nets of Galilee.

In stagnant vivaries they lie,
Forgetful of their ancient haunts;
And how shall he that standeth by
Refrain his open mouth from taunts?

How? By remembering this—that he,
Like them, in eddies whirled about
Felt less: for thus they disagree:
He can, they could not, bear to doubt.'

MORE LIGHT

By the Rev. Bernard M. Hancock, Rector of Bishopstoke, Hants.

THIS age demands reality in religion. The more a man tries to get a grip on reality, the more must he think things out for himself. No authority, however infallible, can excuse the sweat of thought. The more deeply a man thinks the less is he helped by the jargon of conflicting party-mongering professors of religion. Experience has taught the seeker that 'men reason to strengthen their prejudices.'

No word is so sacred on the lips of the Prophet of Nazareth as the word 'Truth.' Yet the history of His Church is not always as encouraging as one would wish for men who seek for Truth. Readers of this journal, however, at their best moments do desire to be true in their search for truth. For this reason they may perhaps be able to throw some light on the problems that puzzle a seeker.

Few will deny that man as man has a desire for 'God.' The psalmist was speaking for all men, or for nearly all men, of all the ages when he uttered the cry, 'My soul is athirst for "*God*"; yea, even for the "*Living*" God. When shall "*I*" come to appear before the Presence of God?'

Philosophy seems better able to co-ordinate most of the experiences of men, if it postulates that there is but one God. Christian theology in order to guard the uniqueness of God sets out with authority the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Some modern thinkers have endeavoured to simplify the conception of God as expressed in Christian theology by teaching us to think of God as 'Perfect truth, perfect beauty and perfect goodness.' This 'Trinity' corresponds to man's mind, emotions and will. But the simplification does not enable us to correlate all the supposed facts of the Christian creed. Sometimes we think that abstract terms are a means of evading clear thinking, or we can make them a sort of 'smoke-screen' to conceal our ignorance from others, if not from ourselves.

History records that some nineteen hundred years ago there appeared in a small province of the great Roman Empire one called Jesus the Christ; the more men from that day to this have thought about the records of the life, work and influence

of this Person, the more puzzled have they been as to the right words they should adopt in which to express who and what He was and is. It by no means follows that the one who is most puzzled is the one who has the least regard for this unique Personality.

* * * * *

Some have thought that if philosophy and theology could accept 'Tritheism' it might be easier to express the truths concerning what is called the 'Incarnation'; particularly if we could accept a 'local' heaven, with a throne occupied by the 'Father' and shared by two equal Assessors. But this apparent 'simplification' has been ruled out of court. Probably, too, like most simplifications, it would only lead to complications.

* * * * *

No man who is a father and who thinks deeply of the mysterious process through which his child has come to be will stumble at what is called 'the Virgin Birth'; for to the man who reverently considers the birth of a child it does not appear to be impossible that if God so willed it a child may be born of a woman without the co-operation of a man. My difficulties lie deeper than this question of a special miracle in the birth of a child.

Christian theology suggests that not only did Jesus Christ give us a nobler conception of God than the world has received through any other channel, but that He himself is one of the three 'Persons' of the Holy Trinity; that He, while still keeping, because God is indivisible, His 'place' in the Holy Trinity, took into that divinity human nature and was 'made man,' and is still man as well as God, though His 'body' is now a 'glorified body.'

The Church has condemned the suggestion that the 'Father' or the 'Holy Spirit' became 'incarnate.' Some of us, however, who have no desire to deny the 'Incarnation,' are puzzled as to how we are to co-ordinate the idea of one God in three Persons and a now eternally Incarnate Son, who is in every sense God and man. We know only too well that it is only the truth that we make our own that fashions our conduct and lights our road. How can we not only purify our hearts but clarify our thinking so as to be able to grip the reality of what we speak of as the Incarnation?

We have been taught that the 'bloody' sacrifices of the Jews were appointed by the God made known to us in Jesus Christ; that they were types and shadows of the 'bloody' sacrifice of the now eternally Incarnate Son of God; that this 'bloody' sacrifice was absolutely essential if the Holy God, in the interests of justice, could 'forgive' men their unholy thoughts, words and deeds. To some minds the matter is settled when we can quote a text that affirms that 'without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.' But there are some who find themselves unable to grip any reality in this. As sometimes explained, the Atonement does not appear to be much more than 'a book-keeping entry' in a firm's business; an entry which does not in fact represent any real transaction.

* * * * *

Forgiveness has been too much connected with the law court instead of being examined from the side of psychology. What God as a Father wants is not the payment of a debt, but a change of outlook in human persons. If we could get this clearer we might make our prisons hospitals for sick souls instead of what they have largely been in the past—workshops for the creation or development of criminals.

* * * * *

The present writer has no desire to deny any Christian doctrine. He is only asking for help to get a grip on the reality the doctrine seeks to express. So much of the jargon of our pulpits passes him by. 'No bell rings within' in response to the words uttered in his hearing.

On no subject do all of us need more to speak with caution and reserve than about the Holy Communion. Confusion about the Atonement leads to confusion and complexity in our discussion about the Holy Communion. Tritheism seems to lie behind some at least of the popular explanations of the simple act of communion ordained by our Lord. We hear about the prisoner of the Tabernacle, of the presence of Jesus in the elements, of our offering of the Son in the Spirit to the Father, of the necessity of Reservation for adoration of Jesus. Then someone comes along and warns us against what he calls 'Jesus worship.' All worship, he tells us, should be directed to the Father. Yet many lose their grip on the reality of worship

unless it is directed to Jesus. Our Prayer-book in the main directs all worship to the Father; in our hymn-books it is very largely directed to Jesus. Matters are further complicated by another voice reminding us that 'we are neglecting the Holy Spirit.'

Sensitive souls are confused and troubled. When that saint, Bishop Arthur Lyttelton, lay dying at Petersfield he sent for Canon Scott Holland because he was worried at having directed his devotions to the Father rather than to the Son. When we approach the learned doctors for advice and guidance on the problems created by our Tritheism, and when we ask how can we worship the Holy Trinity without being Tritheists, they are generally silent. Until we get our philosophy of God clearer and yet true, we shall never get right about the doctrine of the Holy Communion.

* * * * *

In the meanwhile one must go on with the little light one has, and hope that one will be led into fuller truth. All searchers for truth know that 'facts' exist about which they are ignorant; that facts are facts whatever we may think about them. Our mere thinking cannot alter or destroy facts. There is no fact the ultimates of which we can either grasp or explain; for 'all life goes out in mystery, from the writing of a letter to the making of a world.'

* * * * *

The 'Catholic doctrine' about the Holy Communion seems to be very complex. It seems to alter, too, in the course of the centuries. Certainly the emphasis laid on the Holy Communion by some preachers is greater than that placed on it in the New Testament. In the latter much more stress is laid on love for God and man. There is a danger that just as the Sabbath was emphasized by the ecclesiastics in our Lord's ministry to the neglect of charity, so men may to-day argue about the Holy Communion, and lay emphasis on the 'mortal sin' of breaking the fast before Communion, while they think it of less importance that a man should quarrel with the folk in one parish and that, without making peace with those whom he has wronged, he should 'hear Mass' every Sunday in another church in another parish. Our understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Communion would be much clearer if we laid more emphasis on

the last clause of our Church Catechism—'and to be in charity with all men,' and if we would all think out more accurately what is the reality we are trying to express by the words, 'Presence,' 'Sacrifice' and 'The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In Goethe's 'Faust' Mephistopheles counsels theological students to quarrel about *words* and not to mind *things*. What numbers of professing followers of Him Who bore witness to the 'Truth,' are faithfully following the counsel of him who is described as 'the father of lies'! Quiller Couch's famous essay on 'jargon' should be most carefully studied. No one ought to use any of the three phrases quoted above until he has answered, to the satisfaction of a 'Socrates,' the question: 'What is the precise meaning of "Presence," "Sacrifice," and "The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" in connection with the Holy Communion?'

It may not be amiss, before resting satisfied with our answers, to examine ourselves in the light of Dean Inge's terrible indictment, 'Our chief faults in this country are clap-trap—political and clerical—contented ignorance and intellectual insincerity.'

* * * * *

For the moment, in the din of controversy, I hold on to the fact that God is alive and personal; that just as our bodies grow by the appropriation of other bodies, so our 'personalities' grow by the appropriation of other personalities; that just as the kiss, the handshake, are means of appropriating human personalities—means whereby 'they' abide in 'us' and 'we' in 'them'—so the Holy Communion is one way by which the 'personality' of God abides in and is appropriated by our personality; and the means whereby our personality abides in and is appropriated by the personalities of all who share the Communion with us.

The hand, the lips, in the handshake, in the kiss, are not 'transubstantiated' into the person who kisses or who shakes hands; the 'personality' is not in the hand or on the lip. But the hand, the lip, are the channels through which the invisible personality of my friend comes into touch with my equally invisible personality. The 'elements' in the Holy Communion are, as the lip, the hand, the channels, but not the prisons, of a personal activity between God and those who partake of these efficacious signs.

This is very incomplete from the point of view of much that is written and said. But at least it cannot be quite useless if He does abide in me and I in Him. Only let us all beware of imagining that familiarity with a jargon of words, ancient or modern, will of itself enable a man to attain the goal of loving God with all his mind, all his emotions, all his will.

However much we attain to, in the end we shall make our own the last words of Goethe: 'Light! more LIGHT!'

BOOK REVIEWS

SPANISH MYSTICISM[1]

A study of Spanish mysticism, as revealed in these extracts from the writings of its representatives, some of which are now accessible in English for the first time through the unselfish labours of Professor Allison Peers, supplies further evidence of that close agreement between mystics which the Dean of St. Paul's has always maintained exists the world over. Evidently 'the mystical experience is a genuine part of human nature.'[2] In the case of the Spanish mystics this correspondence might partly be explained by their obvious indebtedness to Gerson and, more especially, to Neo-Platonism as mediated to them by Augustine, Gregory, the pseudo-Dionysius, Aquinas, and Eckhart and his school. In one place we fancy that we detect Francisco de Osuna quoting even from Plotinus himself, though it may be only indirectly. Communion with God, he says, is possible to all: 'there is no cause that can take from thee a faculty so wholly thine' (61). Plotinus speaks of the possibility of union with the divine by means of a faculty which all possess but few use.[3]

In spite, however, of the very considerable learning which some of them display, we shall be disappointed if we expect to find these Spanish mystics expounding for our acceptance any consistent system of Christian Platonism. The only two who develop anything like a 'system' are Ramón Lull and Juan de la Cruz, and it is significant that in each case these only work it out in proportion as they travel further from their natural Platonism towards the Scholasticism authorised by the Church. The real Ramón gagged and bound himself in his *Art General;* St. Juan's *Ascent* obscures the real man from sight. Both of them perverted a good idea and worked it to death: Ramón, that religion is reasonable; Juan, that we must die to live. The one produced a system which reduces reason to a logical rationalism, the other a system that would destroy altogether the reason of anyone who committed himself wholly to it; neither system really represented 'the inner man of the heart'—it was the outcome of logic. Logic is a passion with mystics. Unfortunately only the greatest of them can bring it into line with their intuitions, which is precisely what makes them great and their system a worthy philosophy. The rest get hopelessly fogged: sometimes they praise reason, and sometimes they abuse it. The truth is that, as a rule, mystics are intelligent but not intellectual. This, at any

[1] *Spanish Mysticism*, by E. Allison Peers, Methuen and Co., 1924, 272 pp., containing original versions as well as translations. 12/-. *The Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, by the same author, S.P.C.K., 1923, 105 pp.

[2] *Cf.* the Dean's *Plotinus*, Vol. I, p. 2. Dr. Inge's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 213 ff., contain a severe but scrupulously fair criticism of the Spanish mystics.

[3] See Inge's *Plotinus*.

rate, is the charge we must bring against most of the Spanish mystics, in spite of all their learning. Proofs of their inconsistency as thinkers may be seen among the following.

Alonso de Orozco, *e.g.*, is quite sound when he describes, *practically*, the soul's ascent to God. No one may reach the highest stage of contemplation, he says, unless he has 'first wrestled with himself and is a man that is perfect in active life and has practiced . . . the first three degrees of contemplation'[4] (58). Against this we may put the exaggerated doctrine that 'the soul being still in mortal life, may be caught up so as to behold God in His Essence, *without use of the senses*' (56), '*without indirection of any kind*' (58). This is the language of devotion masquerading as philosophy or psychology.

Similarly with Bernardino de Laredo. Contrast his beautiful saying that 'the soul which . . . has the world and its promises placed beneath reason and love has nothing to fear' (81) with his description of mystical theology as knowledge built neither upon natural reason nor admitting of comprehension, to be reached by the 'raising of our affective nature' (76).

Luis de Granada, who bids us 'look up at the sky and begin to philosophize, and argues from created things in sea and sky to God (91 *ff*), can yet speak of 'the muddy pools of created things' (97).

Four of these Spanish mystics, however, seem to set forth the characteristic doctrines of Christian Platonism more consistently than the rest.

Francisco de Osuna: 'All created things are a ladder by which the feet of the wise ascend to God' (16).

Juan de los Angeles: 'No form of created thing can reach this centre (or "apex" of the soul), and in respect of it we are godlike or divine' (136).

Diego de Estella: 'Herein is revealed and declared a great dignity in man, namely that through love he may be transformed and changed into anything that he loves' (156).

Luis de Leon: 'Thus with reason enthroned as empress of the soul, and its other parts reduced to their fit rank, the whole man is in an ordered and peaceful state' (164).

Not one of these mystics, however, is a true metaphysician: the real appeal that they make to us is practical, aesthetic and devotional. From these points of view they all fall into place as a School of Christians, chiefly represented by SS. Teresa and Juan de la Cruz, who possess a strange power of stirring our hearts with longing for heavenly things and our wills to energy in pursuit of them. 'Thou wilt be as holy as thou art loving, and no more,' says Juan de los Angeles (137), and the love he means is the love of God. This possesses him entirely: 'I for God and God for me, and no world beside' (43). No doubt this is one-sided and conducive to error in thought and practice, but there is something elemental about it which overrules all questioning when one hears it and shakes the bases of one's being: it answers to a primary need of the human soul. Those who speak in these tones move the world.[5]

It is one of the pleasantest features about the larger of these books that it contains some poems by the Spanish mystics, translated by Arthur Symons and Aubrey F. G. Bell into poetry of very considerable merit as English.[6] The intense, exotic emotion of S. Juan de la Cruz can hardly be

[4] These are interpreted as knowledge of self, others, and the Cross.

[5] *Cf.* Cardinal Newman and his preoccupation with 'two luminous beings,' God and his own soul. Although we may not think this the ideal way of finding salvation, yet it represents a high philosophic and religious achievement to be quite clear about the existence of God and one's soul and the necessity of bringing them together.

[6] Mr. Bell, we believe, has recently published an independent study of Luis de Leon in the Clarendon Press.

dimmed in the translation of his great poem on the 'Dark Night of the Soul' (given on p. 116).

Upon my flowery breast,
Wholly for him, and save himself for none,
There did I give sweet rest
To my beloved one;
The fanning of the cedars breathed thereon.

All things I then forgot,
My cheek on him who for my coming came.
All ceased, and I was not,
Leaving my cares and shame
Among the lilies and forgetting them.

We should like to quote a sonnet by Pedro Malón de Chaide, but space does not permit. Three of the verses, however, on the theme 'How tranquil is the Life Removed,' by Luis de Leon, are so typical of much Spanish mysticism that we cannot forbear to reproduce them (166). In spite of their selfish spirituality (perhaps because of it) there breathes through them that spirit of marvellous peace and security eventually found of all who strive to 'keep their hearts with all diligence.'

Sleep broken by no fear
Be mine, and daytime clear and bright and free,
Shunning the look severe,
Lofty exceedingly,
Of him whom gold exalts or ancestry.

Me may the birds awake
With their sweet, unpremeditated song;
May I those cares forsake
That e'er to him belong
Who lives not in his independence strong.

I to myself would live,
To enjoy the blessings that to Heaven I owe,
Alone, contemplative,
And freely love forego;
Nor hope, fear, hatred, jealousy e'er know.

Much of the work of these Spanish mystics had a considerable vogue in England during the seventeenth century, and bore fruit not only in the poetry of Crashaw, Vaughan and Donne, but also in the general tendency manifested in English religion during that age to move away from external authority towards a greater reverence for the authority of the human spirit. In the light of this connection, we are not at all surprised to find that six out of the fourteen mystics of whom Professor Allison Peers tells us something incurred at one time or another displeasure or persecution from the rulers of the Church in Spain. If more were known of their lives the case might prove to be the same with some of the others, and this in spite of the reverence of them all for 'directors' and so forth. Mystics are not rebels by nature, but they become so automatically as soon as authority destroys the conditions of its rightful existence by striving to preserve itself instead of training individuals to be free: the essence of mysticism is the liberation of personality.

We shall not attempt to give any account of Santa Teresa, who is usually considered to be the most human, intelligent and practical of all the Spanish mystics, for her place among the Saints is well known. A few more words, however, must be added about Ramón Lull, whom we confess

to liking most of all. The little *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, translated from a larger work by Professor Allison Peers, deserves to rank as an English classic; it has the two lesser merits of being cheap and providing us with food for meditation on every day of the year. Some account of Ramón's life is also added by way of introduction to the translation of this masterpiece.[7]

Although Ramón lived three hundred years before the main School of Spanish mystics, who belong to the sixteenth century, a great deal ('more,' we might add in some cases) is known about him; and we cannot too much emphasise that in default of their exposition of a permanent philosophical system, it is the *lives* of saints rather than their writings (except perhaps their epigrams and aphorisms) which have the power to move and influence us. It is the *Cross* of Jesus which supplies Christianity with all its life and movement. Likewise no one can read of the amazing energies of Ramón Lull, in an age renowned for its colossal all-round achievements, energies crowned by martyrdom most dearly and not cheaply bought, without some stirrings towards high endeavour. We close, however, with some lines of thinly disguised autobiography which reflect the necessary background of 'a life so active and so spiritual' (12 *f*). We choose them also because they are consonant with the spirit that pervades the larger of the books here under review.

'Being then in his hermitage, he would rise at midnight and . . . fall to contemplating the heavens and the stars, and praying with all possible devotion that his soul might be fixed upon God alone . . . After much contemplation and much weeping, his custom was to enter the church and ring for matins, and when his deacon appeared to help him say them. At daybreak he celebrated mass with devotion and spoke of God with his deacon, that on God he might set his love. And as they talked of God and His works they both wept for greatness of the devotion which their argument inspired in them. Then the deacon went into the garden and busied himself with the cultivation of the trees in it, while (he) left the church to recreate his mind, which was wearied by the work he had done, to lift up his eyes to the hills and to let them rest on the plains beneath. Feeling rested at last, he would betake himself again to meditation and prayer, and the reading of Holy Scripture . . . After this he dined . . . and went into the garden, visited the spring, or walked in the places he loved most, afterwards giving himself up for a while to sleep, in order to gather strength for the labours of the night. On awaking he said vespers with his deacon and then remained alone, thinking on what pleased him most and was fittest preparation for his hours of prayer. After sunset he went up to the terrace, and there remained long in devout meditation, his eyes fixed on the heavens and the stars, discoursing with himself on the greatness of God and man's inconstancies. In this state he remained until he retired to rest, and such was the fervour of his contemplation that even upon his bed he found himself in mystic converse with the All-Powerful.'

R.D.R.

A NEW HYMN BOOK.*

No great reform in our public worship can be hoped for unless we can reform our hymnals. It is from hymns far more than from prayers and sermons that the man in the street learns to think as he does think about

[7] A useful account of Ramón Lull by Dr. Major appeared in the Oxford Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman* for 1920 (September).

* *Songs of Praise*. Edited by Percy Dearmer, R. Vaughan Williams and Martin Shaw. (Oxford University Press. Price, 2/6 net.)

religion. All the good which good preaching and stately liturgies may do can be very quickly undone by sentimental hymns, sloshy tunes, and ante-diluvian Sunday School lessons. Therefore Dr. Dearmer is doubtless right in the emphasis he has always laid upon good hymnody and good Sunday School teaching, and his work in both these directions has been quite extraordinarily and culpably overlooked by the Church, which has absorbed so much of his inspiration through the 'English Hymnal,' through the increase of sober and dignified ritual, and through the teaching of children as though they were rational creatures in the making, and not household pets to be humoured with pretty fairy stories and nursery rhymes.

A hymn book for which Dr. Dearmer, Dr. Vaughan Williams and Mr. Martin Shaw are responsible is bound to be taken seriously, and ought to mark a new era in the development of public worship. We cannot judge of the music, of which we should expect great things, for the musical edition is not yet published. We have so far only a book of words.

In the preface we are told that there are close on half-a-million English hymns to choose from, yet in seven widely used and representative collections only sixteen hymns are common to all. There is therefore very little general agreement as to what are, let us say, the hundred best hymns.

Until within the last hundred years there were quite incredibly few hymns about the fatherhood of God, about the teaching of Jesus, about the brotherhood of men, about the beauty of nature, about the work of ordinary lay people: the main themes have been the Judgment of God on sinners, the Redemption by Christ's blood, the Crucifixion, the last Judgment, the Sacraments and Death.

The emphasis upon the actual teaching of Jesus and His way of life is modern, and it is strange to find *how* modern it is. It is also strange, and greatly worthy of meditation, that, whereas the death of our Lord has called forth the most magnificent and ecstatic songs of worship, the hymns about the Resurrection are few, and both poor in thought and halting in expression, so that it is indeed difficult to find anything worthy of being sung at all; and such hymns as we have are more loved for their popular tunes, and from association with the joyful ritual of Eastertide, than from their own intrinsic worthiness.

No one who has not tried his hand at producing a hymnal knows how difficult a task it is, how enormous the actual drudgery as well as the problems to be solved—of taste, of accuracy, of balancing considerations of popularity against indifferent teaching, of good teaching against bad poetry, of a good hymn against a bad and inveterately popular tune, and so on. Those who have tried their hand will, we believe, give the highest praise to Dr. Dearmer's collection. There are certainly more good hymns in this than in any other collection yet published, and certainly fewer bad ones. It is, moreover, a book which would be equally suitable for parish churches, colleges, elementary schools, conferences or Sunday Schools. It is not a party hymnal: it could be used by any English-speaking congregations, and very few churches would find anything left out which they ought, if they value good poetry, to wish to sing, and very few hymns which could jar upon their special views.

There will be, in every collection, some hymns left out which some of us would have wished to see retained. We miss, among Eucharistic hymns, 'Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face,' 'I am not worthy, Holy Lord,' 'Jesu, gentlest Saviour,' 'My God, and is Thy table spread,' 'Once, only once,' 'O Thou, who at Thy Eucharist didst pray.' It may be true that some of these hymns offend the taste of some modern Christians by their emphasis upon redemption by blood; indeed, we know that this is the

case; but it seems to us better, if indeed we are to retain the symbol of the Eucharist at all, which in its very essence does emphasise salvation by feeding upon flesh and blood, to explain what this means in modern speech than to scrap so fine a hymn as Bonar's 'Here, O my Lord' on account of its emphasis on the Eucharistic symbolism. Nor are the authors quite consistent in regard to this, for they have—

'They kindle to a flame
And sound through all the worlds above
The slaughtered Lamb—'

a verse which seems to us to be open to all the objections urged against these hymns so beloved by simple evangelical Christians, which stress the idea of salvation 'through the precious blood.'

There are bound to be these differences in taste, and probably not everyone will congratulate the editors as heartily as we do on their courage in rejecting 'Forty days and forty nights,' 'Christian, dost thou see them,' 'A few more years shall roll,' 'Hark, hark, my soul,' 'Peace, perfect peace,' 'Have mercy on us, God most high,' 'Do no sinful action,' 'We are but little children weak.' The omission of many such sentimental hymns seems to us thoroughly wise and bold; but taste is very singular. One would not expect that the Bishop of Birmingham would (as we remember once) have stood up with great zeal for the beauty of 'Hark, hark, my soul' as one of the finest hymns in the hymn book; and many equally eminent men have tastes which seem to others as strange.

The Editors have made the experiment of including many extracts from classical poems, as, for instance, from Browning's 'Rabbi Ben Ezra,' 'Then welcome each rebuff'; Masefield's 'O Christ, who holds the open gate'; Shakespeare's 'Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth'; Tennyson's 'Ring out the grief'; Walt Whitman's 'Pioneers,' and so on. The success of this experiment will probably depend largely upon the tunes. It is surprising that Christina Rosetti's beautiful 'None other name,' so much beloved by those who have used 'Church Hymns,' should not appear here. Several other hymns very popular among those who have used that collection are here not found—'Eternal God, we look to Thee,' 'Commit thou all thy ways,' 'O most merciful,' and Bishop Heber's 'O Saviour is thy promise fled.'

There are a very great number of new hymns here, including some strong ones by Dr. Dearmer himself. It is impossible to forecast whether many of these will become popular. They are remarkably free from sentimentality, and, generally speaking, mark a real advance upon the emotional pietism of the Victorian era.

We congratulate the Editors upon this bold venture. They have to fight against a very formidable mass of prejudice, and against the still greater barrier of mere inertia. People are so accustomed to sing songs which are entirely nonsensical, and to be happy in doing so, if the tunes catch the ear, that they resent very much being held responsible for singing words which have sense. Not even the 'die-hardest' of Tories objects to singing the 'Magnificat,' but he would be horrified to have it paraphrased in modern prose. There will then be much opposition to any reform of our Church praise, but all who care for sincerity in worship ought to support an effort so carefully thought out as this new hymn book is, and we wish the Editors all good success in their effort to make us sing, as well as pray, with the understanding.

H.A.

THE STATUS OF MIND.*

Dr. C. D. Broad recently published a treatise, *Scientific Thought,* which was concerned with matter as known to the physicist and with mind only as something which perceives and thinks about matter. The present work is concerned with mind, its status and destiny—a more interesting subject.

The subject of mind is no longer approached by philosophers through a discussion of the principles of logic. They recognise that the understanding of mind is bound up with the understanding of organic life, out of which it has originated. A philosopher must first make his choice between alternative biological theories. Dr. Broad examines the Substantial Vitalism of Driesch and rejects it, and Biological Mechanism does not seem to him so satisfactory as what he calls Emergent Vitalism—the theory of Professor Alexander and of Professor Lloyd Morgan. According to this view the characteristic behaviour of an organism *could not*, even in theory, be deduced from the most complete knowledge of the behaviour of its components. That is to say, an organism, though a physico-chemical complex, displays an entirely new quality of existence, which is 'emergent' from the physico-chemical level. This theory of life leads on to a corresponding theory of mind. As life is 'emergent' from matter, so mind is 'emergent' from life, and is similarly related to it.

Dr. Broad deals at considerable length with the relations of body and mind. His treatment of the subject is exhaustive. As in the sphere of biology he rejects the mechanistic interpretation, we need not be surprised to find him repudiating its psychological counterpart—Behaviourism. This theory, which solves the problem by dispensing with mind altogether, and interpreting behaviour in terms of stimulus and reaction, is one of those 'instances of the numerous class of theories which are so preposterously silly that only very learned men could have thought of them.' Yet we may note a certain inconsistency in this rather contemptuous dismissal of a theory whose biological counterpart Dr. Broad seemed not unwilling to entertain, for he only rejects biological mechanism with some reluctance.

Another inconsistency strikes as we proceed. In the biological sphere the 'substantial' vitalism of Driesch had been rejected almost with contumely. Driesch's theory of entelechies is the exact biological counterpart of the animism, in psychology, of McDougall and others. Dr. Broad examines McDougall's theories and rejects them; this is what we should expect from his attitude to Driesch. But the theory he himself propounds about mind seems to us no less fanciful than that of Interactionists like McDougall—in fact even more so. Nor does it seem to us consistent with the Emergent Vitalism which Dr. Broad accepts in the biological sphere, as we shall see in a moment.

His interest in 'psychic research' led Dr. Broad to believe not in the *survival* of mind but in the *persistence* of some element of mind.

> 'Might not what we know as a "mind" be a compound of two factors, neither of which separately has the characteristic properties of a mind, just as salt is a compound of two substances, neither of which by itself has the characteristic properties of salt? Let us call one of these constituents the 'psychic factor' and the other the 'bodily factor.'

Now an 'emergent' theory of mind has no room either for survival or persistence. Professor Alexander, who holds the 'emergent' view, admits this with candid regret in his *Space, Time and Deity.* He would like to believe in survival did his theory allow him to, but it will not.

* *The Mind and its Place in Nature.* By C. D. Broad, M.A., Litt.D. (Kegan Paul, 16/-.)

Now, whereas Professor Alexander seems to prefer consistency to survival, Dr. Broad seems to us to sacrifice it for what he calls 'persistence.' What does he mean by the component parts of mind? Mind is nothing (according to the 'Emergent' Theory) but a new quality of existence displayed by certain highly complex neural processes. How can any part of it survive, or persist, after the neural processes have ceased to exist?

Ought not his acceptance of 'telepathy' and of certain phenomena which seem to indicate the persistence of mind after bodily death to have induced Dr. Broad to reconsider his theories from the top downward?

If an 'emergent' theory of mind seems inadequate to cover certain facts, does not the reflection suggest itself that the 'emergent' theory may be inadequate even in the sphere of biology?

For ourselves, we hold that it is. And we feel that Dr. Broad was hot on the scent when he rejected biological mechanism, *not* because it cannot explain the organism 'as a going concern' (it can), but because it cannot explain the phenomena of development (p. 91).

Dr. Broad treats the 'Unconscious' part of mind at considerable length, and is not too kind to the New Psychology. But we wish he had dealt more at length with the *neural* side of the unconscious, on the lines of its treatment by distinguished neurologists like Dr. Henry Head and Sir C. S. Sherrington (whose names do not occur in the index). We note the omission because we believe that the study of neural process contains the key to a solution of the body-mind problem. Is not that problem really a problem of the relation of function and structure? Which is prior? The mechanists say the latter. But is this certain? Our own experience indicates that it is the former. We modify our neural structure when we form a new habit, *i.e.* here *function* comes first. Unfortunately our own organism is the only one of which we can get inside the skin, but we may be pretty sure the same principle applies throughout the organic sphere.

There is a great deal more we should like to say about this admirable book—especially about the destiny of mind, not in another sphere, but in this, *i.e.* the future of civilisation and of humanity.

> 'Undoubtedly the greatest immediate threat to the further progress of the human mind is the *unequal development* of the three branches of our knowledge, *i.e.* the relatively high degree of our control over inorganic nature, combined with our still very rudimentary knowledge of biology and genetics, and with the complete absence of a scientific psychology and sociology. . . .
>
> 'The more obvious danger of the unequal development of our knowledge lies in the fact that human control over inorganic nature provides men with means of destroying life and property on a vast scale; while the present emotional make-up of men, and their extraordinarily crude and inept forms of social organisation, make it only too likely that these means will be used.'

We can only hope, says Dr. Broad, that Europe will not relapse into barbarism until America has emerged from it—though this, no doubt, will take a long time.

The point about Dr. Broad's book is that any person of average intelligence and medium education can read, enjoy and profit from it. Clergymen should purchase it, even though it costs 16/-; for its open and detached attitude, and its aversion to 'uplift' and to a certain sort of idealism, are both stimulating.

Twice Dr. Broad allows himself a quiet smile at the cloth: once where he says that we dislike 'mediums' because they are blacklegs, and again where he says the clergy erect barbed-wire fences round certain mental

areas with 'Trespassers will be prosecuted' posted up conspicuously. Never mind, he has some sly hits at the philosophers as well: for Dr. Broad has a distinct sense of humour. J. C. HARDWICK.

FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY: A STUDY IN CHRISTIAN ORIGINS.*

Karl Kautsky has produced a bulky volume on so-called Christian Origins, which covers a wide field. Part I deals with the Personality of Jesus, Part II with Roman Society in the Imperial Period, Part III with the Jews, and Part IV with the Beginnings of Christianity.

We have here one of those futile attempts to explain Christianity on more or less mechanical lines. We are given to understand that we know next to nothing about the personality of Jesus, and that the religion which goes by his name can be explained by the circumstances of the times in which it arose and developed.

It may be granted that we do not know a great deal about the founder of Christianity. But as P. W. Schmiedel demonstrated some years ago, we know enough to guarantee not only his historicity but also the originality of his genius. The fact, if it is a fact, that at first his fame did not spread far, of which so much capital is made by writers like Kautsky, has no important significance. It is not surprising that a teacher like Jesus should have appeared in Palestine and created some stir there without attracting at first much attention in other regions. Oriental countries produce, as Rudolf Otto has pointed out, a large number of men who proclaim themselves prophets, claim to work wonders, and attach to themselves many followers, so that to the outside world at first Jesus may well have been lost among a crowd. The important point is that a movement which began in an obscure part of the world gained an impetus which in course of time, and for long after its initiation, focussed men's attention on Jesus and made them realize that he must have been a quite remarkable phenomenon.

The significance of a prophet is seen not so much in the power which he himself exercises immediately as in the power which he imparts to disciples. It is this which carries a movement forward for a long period. Jesus was inspired. More important still, he possessed the power to inspire others. There *was* an apostolic succession. There comes, indeed, a time when the impetus derived from the original power station weakens. A new supply of dynamic power is needed. And the reason why a religious movement waxes and wanes is often that a new supply is not forthcoming where the reality of a new inspiration and of the persistence of the gift of prophecy is denied. Among the Jews religious progress was arrested when at a certain period it was declared that the last of the prophets had appeared. Among Christians religious progress was arrested when it was decided that Jesus and his immediate disciples and apostles had proclaimed the truth once and for all.

The prophets themselves realised the need for new inspiration. From time to time they sought to re-charge themselves with a new supply of spiritual power. It is the same with the movements which they initiated. Every now and then a new impetus is needed. So if a religion like Christianity becomes in course of time weak and powerless, it is because new power has not been allowed to penetrate the husk which has overgrown its kernel. This loss of power seems to be particularly operative where a religion has been transplanted from an Eastern to a Western soil. If

* By Karl Kautsky. Authorized Translation from the Thirteenth German Edition. (Allen and Unwin, Ltd. Pp. 480. 16/- net.)

Christianity should survive in India, where inspiration and prophecy are still permitted to flourish, it may well enter upon a new life, and Indian Christianity may go forth one day to conquer or re-conquer the world. Muhammadanism which clings to soil in which new prophets are still allowed to thrive spreads and expands in a way that puzzles and alarms the representatives of a Christianity which for the time being has lost the power of renewing its life.

Kautsky's explanation of the foundations of Christianity has little regard to religious psychology. It is, as we have said, mechanical. You cannot explain the original impetus of Christianity on mechanical lines. There is something wonderful about it. Something quite inexplicable also, if you refuse to admit the dynamic power of a new and great personality. When the power of a religion begins to fail, it is not because its origin was mechanical but because its growth has become mechanical.

We do not wish to suggest that there is nothing of interest and value in Karl Kautsky's book. There is much that gives food for thought. There is much also that reveals true historical insight. Like Mr. H. G. Wells, the writer, without being a historian, illumines many a page of history, making us view things in a rather new light. But as we read on we feel that the book is leading us nowhere, and that the birth and survival of Christianity still remain a mystery and a miracle. MAURICE A. CANNEY.

A NEW STUDY OF ST. PAUL.*

Dr. Glover stands among the lovers of Paul, not among his detractors. . . . Lagarde, Renan, Nietzsche, and, above all, William Wrede, may decry and deprecate; for the Cambridge scholar the 'ugly little Jew,' with scanty hair, crooked legs, long nose and meeting eyebrows, is 'the greatest human being that ever followed Jesus Christ and had Christ living in him.'

Admiration for one's hero is doubtless a valuable and even essential quality in a biographer; but impartiality of judgment and clear-eyed recognition of defects are no less desirable. And impartial admiration is a virtue necessitating a balance of mind, a steadiness of outlook, an intimacy of understanding which few may claim. If we suggest that Dr. Glover's attitude towards the Apostle errs rather on the side of uncritical approbation, that is not to deny the presence of much which is fresh and illuminating in his latest volume.

But the lover of Paul is not without dislikes and antipathies obvious enough even to the casual reader. Pharisaic Judaism as championed by Mr. Montefiore, the beliefs and temper of Jewish Apocalyptic, the faith and works of the Mystery cults of antiquity—all these are condemned with an emphasis which leaves but little room for impartiality of treatment. And in consequence (as we should expect) the influence of Pharisaism, of Apocalyptic, and of the Mystery faiths upon Dr. Glover's hero is either totally denied or unduly minimised.

The opening chapters, which describe the impact of Tarsus and of Jerusalem upon the mind and outlook of the young Pharisee, are of value in helping to create a background against which the crisis of 'conversion' may be profitably studied. Paul is depicted, in opposition to the theories of Professor Deissmann, as a man of good social position, with a genuine interest in Greek life and amusements, a natural sympathy with the Gentile, an intimate knowledge of the Septuagint, and a working acquaintance

* *Paul of Tarsus.* By T. R. Glover. (S.C.M., 1925.) Price 9/-. Pp. 256.

with Stoic philosophy, derived, however, not from the study, but from life and environment. In Jerusalem the incipient Liberalism of Paul receives a check. 'We can believe that impulses and associations of the Tarsian boyhood were being suppressed by the logical fury of youth, and that the chaos and frenzy of his mind were intensified by this struggle against instinct,' a struggle rendered the more disintegrating by the ever increasing sense of his own inadequacy, his own failure, his own sin. For Paul 'conversion' meant, above all else, the removal of a burden of pressing problems, and the consequent release of energy and concentration of purpose which the shifting of such a weight inevitably achieves. The Damascus road solved at a stroke his doubts as to the reality of a living Jesus, took from his path the stumbling-block of a crucified Messiah, interpreted the puzzle of Righteousness, Sin and Forgiveness in their relation to the Law, and threw a revealing light upon the twin enigmas of God's dealings with Israel and with the Gentile world.

Dr. Glover's treatment of the question: What really happened on the Damascus road? is at once helpful and restrained. 'Are we to say,' he asks, 'that Paul's line of thought, culminating suddenly in a new clarity, produces the vision, or that the vision leads to the clarification of the thought? Probably many psychologists to-day, professed and amateur, would prefer to say the former; Paul said the latter.' And while we may, if we please, agree with the psychologists, yet 'our warrant for excluding the possibility of a risen Jesus of his own choice showing himself to Paul, as the disciples said he did to them, cannot be unimpeachable.' In any case 'Paul's statement here is enough. He *knew* at once that a great change of life was before him; and, if Luke had not told us, we could have guessed that he would ask, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"' Certainly one of the most valuable chapters of the book is that on 'The Life of Obedience,' wherein is traced Paul's own interpretation of the answer given to that question by the living Christ.

Little space is allotted to what many like to call the Pauline Theology. And Dr. Glover is right in saying that to understand Paul we need not so much an intimate acquaintance with 'Paulinism' in the sense of an elaborate and clearly articulated system of theological ideas, as insight, sympathy and, above all, similarity of personal experience. That is why Luther, for example, is more successful than are many modern scholars as an interpreter of the Apostle's mind. Paul aimed not at writing theology, but at explaining his experience of the fact of Christ. To the Pharisee, confronted by the double challenge of an inexorable divine Law and his own palpable inability to obey, there came the knowledge that the Cross 'enabled a man to share God's view of the seriousness of sin, but without despair; it allowed him to hope, to trust, to live, without cheapening God or righteousness.'

We are offered an interesting and suggestive attempt to describe 'the human Paul,' an attempt prefaced by the humbling consideration that 'the difficulty in Paul for the modern student is not to seize the traits of his character . . . but to realise how the whole man is possessed by Christ.' Dr. Glover insists upon the catholicity and intensity of the Apostle's friendships, on his acute sensitiveness to criticism and opposition (it being assumed perhaps rather unwisely that criticism and opposition were invariably without justification) and on his conspicuous sobriety of judgment, coupled with a swiftness of mind which is at once the despair of commentators and the joy of his more imaginative and sympathetic admirers. Of Paul's essential sanity of outlook, Dr. Glover writes: 'Whatever signs we may have

of abnormal psychology, in judgment, clarity and sanity he is the peer of any man'; and, explain the experience of 'conversion how he will,' 'Paul brought to it the test of as sound judgment and as searching experiment as a whole life of verification allowed.'

In his passionate love of Christ must be found the key to the right understanding of the thought and energies of the bond-slave of Jesus. Dr. Glover can make little of the pre-Pauline theology of the primitive Church, and indeed gives but scant praise to the achievements and outlook of the earlier followers of the Carpenter of Nazareth. Apart from courage, enthusiasm and benevolence, there is in them 'a want of nearly every other quality that we associate with the mind of Jesus.' Their Christology is 'rather slow and uncertain,' their temper 'conservative' and 'unobservant,' their fondness for the Temple must be frankly deprecated, and finally 'they remained very much unaware of where they were going.' In this rather indiscriminate condemnation of the early Church we may detect once again our author's tendency to depreciate others for the sake of the greater glorification of his hero, Paul.

Of Paul himself it may be affirmed (1) that he identified the Holy Ghost of formal theology with the Spirit of Jesus, so that 'the indwelling Christ seems to leave nothing distinctive for the Spirit to do or to be'; (2) that he 'does not in explicit description equate God and Christ'; but that (3) 'he assigns to Christ the same functions as to God and the same attributes,' proceeding from Jesus to God and finding 'no difference in mind or nature.' The modern world, we are assured, is not interested in Messianic conceptions, and the same, it is added, was true of the Gentile world of Paul's day, and no less true of Judaism as a whole, and even of Paul himself prior to his conversion. While, therefore, Dr. Glover admits somewhat grudgingly an eschatological background to Paul's thought, yet 'his whole conversion centred on the struggle to determine who that crucified Galilean really was. Everything turned not on a proposition taken from a book, but on the valuing of a historical person.' This is well said, and is true up to a point. And yet we think it is an over-statement, for, however central the person of Jesus to the thought of the Apostle, alike his earlier animosity to the Christian gospel of a crucified Christ, his subsequent glorification of the Cross, and the importance which he (in common with all Christians) attributed to the fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus, prove up to the hilt the importance assigned by him to the doctrine of the Messiah. And however courageously his thought advanced, he never outgrew its Jewish background or ceased to glory in the Christian paradox: *Christus Crucifixus.*

Without doubt Paul's ethical and personal convictions are of greater moment than either his apocalyptic beliefs or the affinities of his thought with conceptions derived from the Mystery faiths. So much may be conceded. But while first things should be put first, to underrate the influence of secondary and less congenial factors can lead only to confusion and loss of perspective. And Dr. Glover's own insistence on the many-sidedness of Paul's character should have safeguarded him against the mistake of supposing that rigid consistency may rightly be looked for in the Apostle's writings. Indeed he himself in the Introduction warns us against this very pitfall. Dr. Glover is free to hold a poor opinion of the writers of Apocalyptic, and a poorer still of the adherents of the Mystery faiths, but that is not to say that the mind of Paul was in reality as unaffected by their influence as our author would desire or even as the Apostle himself may have supposed. And we cannot but regret that on occasion at any rate Dr.

Glover's prepossessions have influenced the soundness of his exegesis, as for example in his treatment of Paul's argument in I Corinthians x. But with so much said, we may properly be grateful to Dr. Glover for having added yet another to his illuminating and thought-provoking studies of New Testament thought. W. M. PRYKE.

PRAYER AND COMMON LIFE.*

There are many books about prayer; but few will deny that Mr. Malcolm Spencer has done well in adding yet another to those already available. As a close student of human relationships and social problems, his sympathy with the active, hard working type of Christianity is obvious enough. Nor does he fail to recognise the danger of emotional introspection, of over-anxiety as to the state of one's own soul. What he seeks is a synthesis of the creative and receptive aspects of the religious life. While the nature of a man's inner life is all important, yet that life's quality must find an adequate expression in social endeavour and achievement. We need, in short, to grasp more clearly the essential relation of prayer to life as a whole. With the recognition that 'the external things in life are choking the internal,' we shall achieve a better co-relation of the practical with the mystical.

Our author knows well enough what are the more crying defects of much contemporary religion. The religion of many is lamentably class-conscious, with the result that 'the mind accustoms itself to commune with the conventional God of respectability, rather than with the God of Jesus Christ.' Too often religion is tainted by legalism, by a false other-worldliness, by an unhealthy preference for the abnormal and the magical.

Writing of the need for positive aims and concrete endeavours, by the pursuit of which 'human progress doubles or trebles its speed,' Mr. Spencer deprecates alike preoccupation with abstract spiritual ends, and the disposition which concentrates effort upon the task of adding inches to the moral stature of other people.

But even granted 'an imagination made quick and sympathetic by reflection upon the Christian ideals of life,' we are still confronted by the question, What must be the nature of our practical response to the disturbing challenge of Christianity? Progress in character, it is contended, must be measured not by reference to some table of abstract virtues, but 'concretely in relation to our work in life.' Thus the case for methodical prayer becomes a strong one, for though no rule can ever be of universal application, yet at bottom the needs of the human spirit vary but little, and prayer will help us in the effort to attend more closely to the relation of our personal life to the achievement of the divine purpose.

Mr. Spencer is right in stressing 'the tremendous spiritual motive power stored up in old phrases and old habits.' He sees in the practice of meditation 'no pious mystery, but a perfectly simple and essential thought-process,' equivalent to 'thinking at its best.' Prayer itself is best understood as 'a daily act of personal recommitment to the God-ward attitude in everything.'

In connection with Mr. Spencer's book we may call attention to two volumes compiled anonymously for devotional purposes. The first of these consists of a year's course of Bible readings, and the second of a selection

* *Prayer and Personality.* By Malcolm Spencer, M.A. (S.C.M., 1925. Price, 4/- and 2/6. Pp. 147.)

Highways of the Spirit. Two volumes. (S.C.M., 1924. Vol. I, price 5/-; Vol. II, price 2/6.)

of Bible prayers for use in conjunction with the former. The Publications Department of the Student Christian Movement appear to regard these volumes as the most important of those issued by them during the last twelve months. Certainly they should be of use in the promotion of regular and intelligent methods of Bible study and meditation.

W.M.P.

THE RIGHT WAY TO DO IT.*

It would not be an over-statement to describe Mr. H. K. Luce's volume, *St. Matthew's Gospel in English*, as a revolution in commentaries intended for school use. Those who in their own school days suffered from commentaries at once devoid of interest in themselves, and wholly out of touch with the world as seen through a boy's eyes, will welcome this indication of the possibility of better things.

Mr. Luce is an avowed Modernist. He has the power of writing notes which are brief, arresting and to the point. His introduction is clear, interesting and adequate as a background for the intelligent study of the Gospel. He can say what he has to say in language which is straightforward and untechnical. And, above all, the figure of Jesus as he presents it is attractive, human, convincing, and hence irresistible in its appeal to the mind of youth.

School commentaries, and not these only, display as a rule a positive genius for avoiding crucial points, slurring over difficulties and substituting edifying platitudes for honest attempts to grapple with the host of problems by which any intelligent reader of the Gospels is inevitably confronted. Mr. Luce takes us at once away from the stifling atmosphere of unreality and insipid commonplace. He credits his readers with a desire to think for themselves, and at no time is he haunted by the bugbear of an unsettled faith. The word legend has no terrors for him, and he allows frankly for the influence of later ideas upon the words and acts of Jesus as the evangelist records them. Difficulties are never shirked, and throughout we have the impression that the author writes in the interests of truth, endeavouring to present a portrait of Jesus in harmony with the facts, and to relate His teaching as closely as possible to the outstanding problems of modern life, and more particularly to those problems as they present themselves to the mind of the adolescent.

We understand that commentaries by Mr. Luce on the Gospels of Mark and Luke are to appear shortly. Their wide use in public and secondary schools is much to be desired, for it would lead, as we believe, to a raising of the whole level of religious teaching, by transforming the Scripture lesson from a necessary evil into a genuine opportunity for the effective study of the life, teaching and permanent significance of Jesus Christ.

Major Povah's little book, *A Study of the Old Testament*, is to be commended scarcely less highly. It is intended primarily for use in Church Tutorial Classes, and in twenty-one short chapters covers the whole period from the early tribal history of Israel to the coming of Christ. The book is a model of clear exposition, and is written on the basis of an adequate critical study of the Old Testament. The material which it contains has been actually employed by the author for the purposes of oral teaching.

W.M.P.

* *St. Matthew's Gospel in English.* By H. Kenneth Luce, M.A. (A. and C. Black, 1925. Price, 3/6. Pp. 111.)

A Study of the Old Testament. By J. W. Povah, B.D. (S.C.M., 1925. Price, 2/6. Pp. 103.)